

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE HEROIC TRAGEDIES OF DRYDEN: THEORY AND PRACTICE

BY



PAULINE WING-YUK TAO

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS.

Department of English.

Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
September, 1967.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Heroic Tragedies of Dryden: Theory and Practice", submitted by Pauline Tao in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

- ABSTRACT -

Dryden's heroic tragedies are more often tolerated than discussed. If they are studied at all, the critics trace the pedigree of the genre, weigh the quantity of foreign influences, and anatomize the ideas. The impression of Dryden as a dramatist thus arrived at is fragmentary and disjunctive.

This thesis does not attempt to add another to the endless debates on whether love is more important than honour or whether the Heroic Tragedy had an English origin rather than a French. In this study, the heroic tragedies are viewed not as an exclusive, anomalous group, but in relation to Dryden's critical writings in which he probed for a new direction for the "restored" theatre after the Puritan suppression.

For Dryden, theory is not dogma. It is only when it passes the test on the stage that the set of theory becomes effective. Thus he begins with rhyme and a dramaturgy modelled on the epic. He ends in blank verse and plays that are distinctly classical. The question is not whether Dryden vacillates but whether his plays mature with him.

Three chronologically consecutive plays have been chosen to answer this question: the Conquest of Granada, Part I (1670) and Part II (1671); Aureng-Zebe (1675); and All for Love (1677). They best reveal Dryden's intentions and efforts when they are examined structurally rather than thematically, and when the characterization of their heroes is analyzed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I Dryden's Theory of the Heroic Tragedy.....	1
II The Structure of the Heroic Tragedies.....	31
III The Heroic Heroes.....	61
IV Conclusion.....	73
Notes - Chapter I.....	77
Notes - Chapter II.....	82
Notes - Chapter III.....	85
Notes - Chapter IV.....	86
Bibliography.....	87

- CHAPTER I -

- DRYDEN'S THEORY OF THE HEROIC TRAGEDY -

The Restoration saw the Heroic Play bud, bloom, and fade in around twenty years.¹ Its short life span is not impressive; nor is its popularity extensive, having for its regular patrons only the courtly and the wealthy. But in view of the action, both dramatic and critical, which it precipitated, it certainly demands proper attention. The revived theatres were action packed, producing a new play every five to seven days for an avid, though circumscribed audience. The prefaces of the printed plays were eagerly seized upon as occasions for self advertisement and justification, ink slinging, and the medium of the hottest literary controversy, polemics, and embroilment that had ever been enacted.² Dryden and his contemporaries believed that they were exploring a new kind of tragedy--the "heroic tragedy", probing more deeply into the "headlands, and promontories, and some few outlines" mapped out by Sir William D'Avenant and consolidated by the Earl of Orrery. They found that the "ruined estate" of Elizabethan drama promised them little future, for "there is scarce an humour, a character, or any kind of plot, which they have not blown upon." They were faced with a choice of "either not to write at all, or to attempt some other way."³ The success of D'Avenant and Orrery opened the potential of another kind of drama which, with its heroic couplets, majestic actions, and stage adornments, not only broke away from the shackles of their Elizabethan predecessors, but also in-

jected a timely stimulant into an age of changing taste. The birth of the Heroic Tragedy was not smooth and rapid. In Dryden's words, "betwixt the shaking off an old habit, and the introducing of a new, there should be difficulty", and Dryden's career in this field presents the struggle of a new-born genre and its acceptance by the world.⁴

Critics have often expressed exasperation with Dryden's "mercurial temper". They set out to find a consistent theory only to find Dryden endorsing, with seeming ease, an opinion which he has just animadverted in earnest. Margaret Sherwood regards this as "literary indecision" rather than as "literary fair-mindedness".⁵ A.C. Kirsch suggests that Dryden's vacillation stems from his inclination to submit theoretical commitments to the demands of his practice, as, for example, when he switches to blank verse after a full-fledged campaign in favour of rhyme. He also points out that misunderstanding of Dryden's intention is inevitable when Dryden is yet groping for adequate critical terms in dramatic criticism and when ambiguities are unavoidable.⁶ Some take Dryden's remark "for I confess my chief endeavours are to delight the age in which I live" out of context and explain his lack of critical integrity as his currying favour from the audience. Perhaps we shall do more justice to Dryden if we treat with equal importance his conviction that, in spite of the immense popularity of comedy, tragedy was still the superior and significant art form.⁷ His chief concern was the Heroic Tragedy, though he could be far better off financially writing comedies. His integrity lies in

the persistent faith that it was in tragedy that his own age and talent excelled. In the "Preface to An Evening's Love" (1671), he proposes to show "in what parts of Dramatic Poesy we were excelled by Ben Jonson, I mean, humour, and contrivance of comedy; and in what we may justly claim precedence of Shakespeare and Fletcher, namely in Heroic Plays." He would not have doubted in the least when Eugenius proclaimed that "the drama is wholly ours."⁸ Dryden's apparent ecumenical standpoint in criticism can best be approached by first understanding the fervent enthusiasm, hope, and sincerity of a young artist sensing the immense possibilities of a rejuvenated art form and who was prepared to infuse into it all the best that dramatic theory, practice, and tradition had to offer. Living in an age in which problems in drama engaged the best European literary minds, Dryden responded and reacted to their profuse theories. The continual concessions, modifications, and accommodations he made indicate rather the maturing of his critical attitude than the lack of discriminating principle.⁹ Dryden's principle is always there: to bring tragedy to perfection with the dicta of Aristotle and Horace, the achievements of Sophocles and Shakespeare, and the need of the existing age all in one view. Typical of his method is the one he declares to have adopted in portraying the hero in the "Preface to All for Love" (1678): "I have therefore steered the middle course"; and, under the name of Neander, he suggests that the best way to solve the question whether narration of violent actions should be preferred

to a full representation of them is that "a mean betwixt both should be observed by every judicious writer, so as the audience may neither be left unsatisfied by not seeing what is beautiful or shocked by beholding what is either incredible or undecent."¹⁰ All through his essays, he seldom changes his belief in the importance of relevance to life in art, and the necessity to continue the English tradition. His admiration for Rymer does not hamper him from objecting to the latter's arbitrary condemnation of many Elizabethan plays because they deviate from the model of their Greek predecessors: "for tho' nature...is the same in all places, and reason too the same, yet the climate, the age, the dispositions of the people to whom the poet writes may be so different that what pleased the Greeks would not satisfy an English."¹¹ In the "Preface to All for Love", what seems to be a total conversion to the cause of the Ancients who, Dryden agrees with Rymer, "are and ought to be our masters" is clarified by his immediate observation that "they are too little for English tragedy, which requires to be built in a larger compass."¹² It is this eagerness to preserve the national dramatic heritage against the prestige of the French stage and the prominence of the Greeks that G.R. Noyes considers to be one of the greatneses of Dryden: he "connects his own time with the great Elizabethan dramatists."¹³

To associate the Heroic Tragedy with the epic is one of Dryden's endeavours to get the best for the new genre. Whether Dryden means partially to fulfil his wish of writing a Virgilian epic in the Heroic

Play as R.A. Brower suggests is not certain, but there is no denying that the tendency to invest tragedy with an epic frame is to a great extent influenced by the notion that the epic is, in Rapin's words, "the greatest and most noble in Poesy...the greatest work that human Wit is capable of."¹⁴ Identification of the two genres does not begin with Dryden. Aristotle maintains that the two kinds are similar and that a critic who can judge one can judge the other. Hobbes divides poetry into three categories: "Heroique, Scommatique, and Pastorall", and epic and tragedy are housed under one roof: "the Heroic Poem narrative...is called an Epique Poem. The Heroic Poem Dramatique is Tragedy."¹⁵ Dryden notes "a great affinity" between tragedy and "the epic way" in "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy" (1668); identifies them in the "Preface to Tyrannic Love" (1670); and in 1672 feels sure enough to define the Heroic Play as "an imitation, in little, of an heroic poem."¹⁶ Dryden does not stop at this point. To him, a play based on the imitation of the epic not only inherits its attainments but also surpasses it, because the play "represents to view what the poem only does relate", and is, therefore, more "lively an Image of human Nature". He reiterates this point later in the letter to the Lord Marquess of Normanby: "I know not of any advantage which tragedy can boast above heroic poetry, but that it is presented to the view as well as read, and instructs in the closet as well as on [sic] the theatre."¹⁷ The word "instruct" invests on tragedy a moral dimension without which art cannot stand in the Neo-classic age. Dryden

manages therefore to justify the sovereignty of the Heroic Tragedy in terms of both artistic achievement and social utility.

Dryden, however, realizes only long afterwards that similarity between the epic and tragedy is extraneous and superficial. As he himself has pointed out in "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", the "great affinity" between the two "may easily be discovered" in "the genus", "the end", and "the characters and persons", that is, the content. The method of presentation, or "the manner of acquainting us with those actions, passions, and fortunes", is different. In "Of Heroic^c Plays" he is still not able to see beyond a parity in content. Since tragedy ought to be an imitation of an heroic poem, he says, "Love and Valour ought to be the subject of it."¹⁸ The shift from using "the epic poem" to "an heroic poem" is significant. Whether the change is deliberate on Dryden's part is debatable, for the name "Heroic Poem" designates a new kind of epic which Tasso initiated--the classico-romantic epic in which chivalrous love rivals the traditional epic virtues of valour, courtesy, generosity and pity as a mainspring of action.¹⁹ Hobbes proves the importance of love in his essay "The Virtues of an Heroic Poem" (1675): "For the work of an Heroique Poem is to raise admiration, principally, for three Vertues, Valour, Beauty and Love."²⁰ This to an extent departs from the Homeric type of poem in which love is secondary and portrayed as a malady and temptation, detrimental to the hero's honour. Love, more as an uplifting and civilizing power than a naturalistic

passion, had been rising to prominence ever since. On the English stage, Beaumont and Fletcher, followed by the Caroline dramatists, made love into as legitimate an interest in the serious plays as in the comedies. During the Commonwealth and the Restoration, the love oriented prose romance epics of Calprenède and Scudéry were relished by readers on both sides of the Channel. In France, love was so much the preoccupation of Corneille and Racine that Rapin reacted in alarm: "'tis to degrade tragedy from that majesty which is proper to it, to mingle in it love, which is of a character always light, and little suitable to that gravity of which tragedy makes profession."²¹

We have Dryden's words as to the popularity of love in the Restoration period: "Love and honour now are higher raised" than the previous age in which "love was mean".²² Dryden's advocacy of love shows a glad acceptance of both French and English influences. The French, notably Saint-Evremond, are disconcerted at the predominance of crude passions, often unpunished, in the Greek tragedies to arouse pity and terror. To Saint-Evremond, "there is no passion that excites us more than a good love for anything that is noble and generous" and love is therefore needed in the new kind of tragedy in order "to rid ourselves the better of the black thoughts that the ancient kind left through superstition and terror."²³ Besides its reformatory spell, love is a common passion that is experienced by the great and the low alike. It is the "secret bond" linking the audience with the heroes and heroines on the stage. Dryden's view is almost identical: love is

"the common-place of pity", "the most frequent of all the passions, and which, being the private concernment of every person, is soothed by viewing its own image in a public entertainment."²⁴ However, his argument that love, among other things, should be included for variety is English in origin. In spite of Aristotle's endorsement, the restrictive plot and exclusive characterization of ^a Ancient tragedy ^{are} is too threadbare when compared to its English counterpart. The "labyrinth of design" of English tragedies has added much to suspense and richness. Apart from having roused pity and fear, Shakespeare also has room for impressive descriptions of friendship; and the English inclusion of "new passions", especially that of love, is a positive merit. Though Dryden has no bone to pick with the French in weaving love into the proper fabric of serious plays, he deplores the severe restrictions that the French have imposed on this passion under an ostensible obedience to the unity of action. For love to be human and interesting, it should be attended by its kindred passions, or in Eugenius's words, by a "thousand other concernments of lovers; as jealousies, complaints, contrivances, and the like..."²⁵ Dryden's reason for a variety of passions receives a moral overtone in "Heads of an Answer to Rymer". He has come to think that the function of tragedy extends beyond the simple moving of pity and terror as proposed by Aristotle. It is to "reform manners by delightful representation of human life in great persons, by way of dialogue." In this way, in addition to pity and terror, "all the passions...are to be set

in a ferment: as joy, anger, love, fear are to be used as the poet's commonplaces" in order to bring that "love to virtue and hatred to vice."²⁶

Another feature of the Heroic Tragedy which is found foreign to the epic is the exotic setting and alien heroes. D'Avenant makes it a point in the "Preface to Gondibert" that he chooses deliberately "those of a former age than the present, and in a Century so far remov'd" that he can avoid what he calls the "shackles of an Historian".²⁷ Rymer points out that this is where D'Avenant diverges from the "Epick Poets before him". They used to "adorn their own Countrey, there finding their Heroes and patterns of Virtue", instead of which D'Avenant's heroes "are all Forreigners. He cultivates a Countrey that is nothing akin to him."²⁸ In fact, it is exactly in not choosing a country and time that has anything to do with his own that D'Avenant thinks he is able to overcome the indomitable scepticism of his readers and audience. He finds that people are more easily led to believe in the glory of virtue "at distance then neer", and since "to make Great Actions credible is the Principall Art of Poets", he advises that poets should "remove the Scene from home."²⁹ Dryden is respectful to D'Avenant as the originator of the Heroic Play, and he obviously finds this advice acceptable, for his Montezuma hails from Mexico, Almanzor from Granada, Aureng-Zebe from India, Maximin and Antony from Rome. What seems paradoxical is that, in counteracting scepticism, D'Avenant and Dryden have

fallen into the romantic extreme and built instead a purely imaginative world unreasonably removed in time from the kind of civilization they are in. Not without their effects on this tendency are the French epic romance and the current practice of extensive borrowing of plots from French, Spanish and Italian literature. Both either encourage or necessitate a foreign setting. The resultant product is closer in spirit to Apollonius Rhodius's Argonautica than Homer's Iliad or Odyssey. The epic about the Argonauts is a romantic reconstruction of a legendary past, in which the sentiment and refinement of a highly civilized age are projected into the semi-barbarous past. To top all the possible causes for this choice of remote setting and time, we can perhaps take into account a prevalent theory in the Restoration that in order to preserve a greater illusion of truth in the plays the plots should be taken from history, preferably a period in which memory is hazy: "for where the event of a great action is left doubtful," Dryden asserts, "there the poet is left master."³⁰ Thus while the Restoration theatre-goers roar in laughter at the follies of their contemporaries in the comedies, the playwrights have to dig into the past and distant lands for virtues and heroic deeds--the subject of tragedy.

One element of the epic that is borrowed and fervently copied in the Heroic Tragedy is the supernatural. The renovated stage and the use of painted scenery and machinery make the most spectacular vision or the most eerie visitation possible, and hardly a heroic play is staged without an apparition or a portent to impress its audience. In addition to

this are dances and songs--remnants of the courtly masque, and the tumultuous actions of battles, duels, sieges, conquests that recall the glories of the Elizabethans. Dryden notes wistfully the unhappy tendency of the Heroic Tragedy to depend for its appeal more and more on

Charm! song! and show! a murder and a ghost!³¹

He is not unconscious of the fact that it is to meet the taste of the audience that these bizarre and extravagant entertainments are included for their own sakes. The emphasis on love coincides with the increase of women spectators in the theatres, who, as Anne Righter points out, never fail to be pleased by the sight of heroes daring heaven and hell, flouting emperors and kings, only to succumb meekly to their lovers.³² The pompous scenes of celestial bliss or prodigious visions are invariably guarantees of a good box-office. This makes Dryden's position embarrassing, for while he insists that art is flexible and that it should change with the taste and custom of the age, he is against "run[ning] down with the stream, or to please the people by their own usual methods." Moreover, he has to justify this large lump of romanticism to his critics to whom everything is explained and deprecated in terms of reason. They insist on naturalism in art, as nothing other than realistic truth can satisfy the discerning and sceptical reason. Dryden defends himself by placing the responsibility of creating the "astral or aerial spirit"; on the epic poets, whose authority, he argues, is "also the best argument". Having made his position secure by aligning with the Ancients, he proceeds to show that

the heroic poet and, by analogy, the heroic playwright, enjoys what he is later to develop into the theory of "poetical licence":

an heroic poet is not tied to a bare representation of what is true, or exceeding probable, but he may let himself loose to visionary objects, and to the representation of such things as depending not on sense, and therefore not to be comprehended by knowledge, may give him a freer scope for imagination.³³

The basis of concession for such artistic freedom is "imagination", which is legitimate enough to violate the naturalistic rules of scientific truth, probability, sense and knowledge, to give realization to gods and spirits--"those enthusiastic parts of poetry which compose the most noble parts" of the writings of Homer and Virgil, Tasso and Spenser. Without the Enchanted Wood or the Bower of Bliss, the Jerusalemme Liberata and the Fairie Queene would have lost most of their charm. Dryden, however, does not hesitate to add that even if you want to judge on realistic grounds, these supernatural beings are not unnatural, because "in all ages and religions the greater part of mankind have believed the power of magic, and that there are spirits or spectres which have appeared." His desire to have both sides of the argument is clear when he claims in the "Apology for Heroic Poetry" (1677) that even if the poet describes things which do not exist and yet are founded on popular fancy, he is allowed to do so, "for 'tis still an imitation, though of other man's fancies."³⁴

The controversy over the presence of supernatural elements in the Heroic Tragedy constitutes but one facet of Dryden's efforts to reconcile the main dilemma of his age--the romantic theory of the imagin-

ation versus a perverted interpretation of Aristotle's formalism, chiefly "imitation" and "probability". Lisidieus and Crites speak for almost all the neo-classicists when they assert that "the spirit of man cannot be satisfied but with the truth, or at least verisimilitude"; therefore, "the nearer anything comes to the imitation of it, the more it pleases." Dryden's principles in creative art are basically romantic, though his consciousness of and frequent reference to the neo-classic belief have caused W.P. Ker to declare that the key word of Dryden's argument "nature" is mutable and ambiguous.³⁵ Yet, even if it is characteristic of Dryden to accommodate the opposite view in any debate, his esteem for the primacy of the imagination is apparent.

Dryden contends that the meaning of "the imitation of nature" cannot be taken to mean an exact, faithful reproduction of life. Imitation is not "to take every lineament and feature" of nature, but "to take so much only as will make a beautiful resemblance of the whole; and, with an ingenious flattery of nature, to heighten the beauties of some parts, and hide the deformities of the rest."³⁶ This is a plea for artistic selection against photographic likeness, and artistic truth against scientific truth. Indeed, to demand that the play produce an exact copy of life and its actualities is to demand the impossible. Dryden from the very start recognizes the subtle division between life and art: "the stage [is] the representation of the world and the actions in it, how can it be imagined that the picture of human life can

be more exact than life itself is?"³⁷ There may be some very close imitations of life which Dryden calls the "worse likeness" of nature, such as common persons, ordinary conversation, mundane actions; but they are tolerated in comedy because "that is often to produce laughter, which is occasioned by the sight of some deformity"; and because comedy is in its own nature "inferior to all sorts of dramatic writing." Tragedy is different. Its subject matter and characters are required to be weighty and great, its actions and passions grand and exalted. A close observation of life in its grossness will not be able to capture the "nature" of tragedy, which is "nature wrought up to an higher pitch".³⁸ The imitation of such a nature is to be executed by imagination to achieve a "better likeness" of what we find in life, with the "notorious blemishes" artistically removed or hidden. This is how Dryden differentiates between imitations in comedy and tragedy. But for art in general, there is a ring of Sidney's "Her [nature's] world is brazen, the poets only deliver a golden" idea when Dryden affirms that the object of painting and poetry is "not only true imitations of nature, but of the best nature, of that which is wrought up to a nobler pitch. They present us with images more perfect than the life in any individual."³⁹

As the Heroic Tragedy also partakes of the essence of the epic, it is allowed by the law of the Heroic Poem to raise nature to a greater height, and the heroic poet is given "a further liberty of fancy, and of drawing all things as far above the ordinary proportions

of the stage as that is beyond the common words and actions of human life."⁴⁰ Dryden does not happen to plead for the superiority of the imagination or fancy just because the heavy romantic content of his Heroic Tragedies needs a justification. He has taken care of that quite comfortably. To him, imagination is the soul of all creative art. Every composition, whether it be a poem, a play, or a painting, is built in three stages: invention, or "the proper finding of the thought"; fancy, "the adorning of that thought"; and elocution, "the art of clothing and adorning that thought in apt, significant and sounding words".⁴¹ Though Dryden would be much happier in his definition of "invention" had he had at his disposal a store of modern critical terms such as "originality", "individuality", and "inspiration", nevertheless he makes its importance definite by asserting that "without invention, a painter is but a copier, and a poet but a plagiary of others."⁴² In the "Preface to An Evening's Love" (1671), he remarks that the excellency of a poet rests on the "largest field of fancy." It can be seen that to Dryden "invention" and "fancy" constitute different stages of the imagination. In this he anticipates Coleridge.

It is interesting to note how close Dryden sometimes comes to Coleridge. A greater number of the "Enlightened" people assume that reason and imagination are incompatible, for reason believes in factual truth, which is the only thing to which imagination cannot be tied. It follows that any description that bases on the imagination alone is inevitably worthless, as it bears no connection to what one sees,

hears, and feels--in short, to reason and actuality. Or to people like Howard, imagination operates within the framework of reason. When reason becomes sceptical, imagination is paralysed.⁴³ Dryden sees no disparity in the function of these two faculties. In fact, they cooperate to produce the Seventeenth-Century version of Coleridge's theory of the Suspension of Disbelief:

Imagination in a man...is supposed to participate of reason, and when that governs...reason is not destroyed, but misled, or blinded: that can prescribe to the reason, during the time of the representation, somewhat like a weak belief of what it sees and hears; and reason suffers itself to be so hoodwinked that it may better enjoy the pleasures of the fiction.⁴⁴

What causes the people to reject imagination on the ground of reason is their attitude--a tendency to take everything literally. How can one expect them to believe word for word, says Dryden, ^{that} "in angels 'all dissolved in hallelujahs lie", for example? To defend imagination simply on the basis of poetic licence, the "birthright" of the poets, is not enough. The people have to be educated that they are not obliged as in history, "to a literal belief of what the poet says; but you are pleased with the image, without being cozened by the fiction."⁴⁵ This last remark does not contradict a proposition he puts forward in 1668, that everything in the play should be "exalted above the level of common converses as high as the imagination of the poet can carry them with proportion to verisimilitude."⁴⁶ The play as a whole should still be anchored in truth; but the imagination should be allowed to

transgress the bounds either in imaging or in conceit, to uplift and invigorate the play.

Dryden's romantic attitude is carried to his opinion of rules, chiefly the three unities. He may have distressed some by an earnest endorsement of the unities on the one hand, as when for example he boasts that one of the beauties of his All for Love is that "the unities of time, place, and action [are] more exactly observed than, perhaps, the English theatre requires";⁴⁷ while on the other hand he seems to retract totally his esteem for them in one sentence: "I knew them and had them in my eye, but followed them only at a distance; for the genius of the English cannot bear too regular^a play."⁴⁸ Dryden's seemingly contradictory remarks do not cancel each other out, nor is his apology for the "genius of the English" a mere cover-up for his inability to write a "regular" play. In both of the above quotations, his stress is on the English theatre--the theatre where the Elizabethan plays still hold a strong popularity. His evaluation of the three unities throughout his career, even at the height of conservatism, is based on whether they will contribute positively to his native drama. Considering the decadent state into which Elizabethan drama has sunk as the result of excess and undisciplined individualism, there is an urgent need to have clogs tied to the "high-ranging spaniel" of imagination. Blank verse is being exploited to the point of exhaustion; violent actions are developed to the state when the last act is brought to a finish by the remaining characters killing one another

in succession; and many of the plots "were made up of some ridiculous incoherent story, which in one play many times took up the business of an age."⁴⁹ Howard perhaps best represents the racy disorganization of the imagination which they called freedom: there is "no better a reason from any ingenious person than his Fancy for which he best relishes", and it is ridiculous to "give rules to things that are not mathematical."⁵⁰ Though imagination or fancy is the touchstone of art for Dryden, he believes that imagination should be systematic. This is the basis which he shares with many neo-classic writers when he claims that rules are helpful and necessary "to obtain the end", which is no other than "imitating nature rightly". Indeed rules are "the means which conduce to the imitating of nature." Dryden's concept of the use of rules is three-fold: for the writer, it directs the imagination to its proper channel--truth, and, secondly, advances literary performance; for the reader, it informs the judgment and reforms the tastes. It can be seen that all these three uses would involve an active play of judgement to balance the fancy. To Dryden, "judgement" controlling "fancy" is the poet's double talent.⁵² A poet without art is a contradiction in terms.

Dryden, however, recognises that rules can be a good servant but a bad master. Many have made a sine qua non out of the rules and a canon out of the three unities. A more obdurate advocate of the rules is not to be found than Rapin; who prescribes that "the only certain way to please is by Rules" and that "'tis by these Rules that

all becomes just, proportionate and natural". Apart from this, he arbitrarily equates the unities to verisimilitude, which by the late seventeenth century has come to mean the likeness of actuality down to the last detail: "'Tis only by these rules that verisimilitude is maintained, which is the soul of Poesy. For unless there be the unity of Place, of Time, and of the Action in great poems, there can be no verisimilitude."⁵³ To keep the three unities intact, the writers have to execute the three "C"s--to compress the duration of the action to one day, or better, three hours, to confine the place of action to one spot, and to circumscribe the action to one. In addition to all these, there is the liaison des scènes which commands that the stage should not be cleared nor the scenes broken. There is much that Corneille can "boast" of in his Le Cid, especially where time is concerned. In order to close the final action not later than twenty-four hours from the initial one, the hero, Rodrigue, manages to fight a duel, repel an invasion, and defeat his rival in love all in one day, only to be remembered as the greatest piece of incongruity in literature. The absurd result of Thomas Corneille's observance of the unity of place and unbroken scenes in his L'amour à la mode in which "the street, the window, the two houses, and the closet, are made to walk about, and the persons to stand still" has never failed to amuse Dryden. In attaining one beauty, the rigid neo-classicists have inadvertently sacrificed greater beauties, not to mention incurring ridicule and absurdity in their effort. It is not without a feeling of contempt that Dryden com-

compares the so-called correct writer to a man of little means:

A wary man he is in grammar, very nice
as to solecism or barbarism, judges to a
hair of little decencies, knows better
than any man what is not to be written,
never hazards himself so far as to fall,
but plods on deliberately, and...is sure
to put his staff before him.⁵⁴

He will do anything not to offend "decorum" or break the least significant rule, but his work will turn out to be, in Dryden's expression, "dull, insipid, languishing, and without sinews," which is far from being the proper way of imitation.

Just as "man is not made for the Sabbath but the Sabbath for man", Dryden deems that the unities are there to help, not to direct. They are most "mechanic beauties of the plot", or, according to Corneille, "concepts of perfection in tragedy" rather than their being "so necessary that the lack of them will render a work defective."⁵⁵ Not absolutes, they can be or should be modified so that, in obeying the rules of art, one can avoid shining against the rules of nature. Dryden's preference for a liberal interpretation of the three unities is to an extent prompted by his regard for the variety and liveliness of traditional English drama. That is especially so in the early period of his career when he suggests a compromise of the French theatrical rules and the English variety of action, but deliberately forgets to do so in the Conquest of Granada, in which predominantly English characterization, intricate plot, and tumultuous actions form the ground-work of the play. Dryden's gradual leaning to classical

expression begins with Aureng-Zebe (1676) and he reaches his goal in All for Love (1677) when he rejects rhyme in favour of blank verse and reinforces decorum and rules. This practice does not persist for long, for Dryden soon returns to the "middle course". In Don Sebastian (1690), he confesses that the scenes are sometimes broken "because my underplot required them so to be"; and that the time is stretched to two days "because the variety of accidents which are here represented could not naturally be supposed to arrive in one."⁵⁶ What Dryden wishes to achieve in his numerous experiments is a reasonable stringency in form and expression to bring sanity and order back to the writing of plays after the Elizabethan extravagance; yet within that stringent form there should be an adequate play of fancy, which after all, "gives the life touches and secret graces" to a work of art.

Despite many arguments to the contrary, rhyme is associated as closely with the Heroic Tragedy as honour with the heroic hero. Dryden himself also considers this as a feature that distinguishes the genre. In "Of Heroic Plays" he remarks that it is in the Heroic Tragedy alone that "I have used [rhyme] without the mixture of prose."⁵⁷ Rhyme constitutes one of the most important undertakings in Dryden's career as a dramatist. Involved in the heated argument over this issue are two major differences, which Dryden sums up in "Of Heroic Plays":

All the arguments which are formed against [rhyme] amount to no more than this, that it is not so near conversation as prose, and there-

fore not so natural. . . . We thought, because Shakespeare and Fletcher went no farther, that there the pillars of poetry were to be erected; that, because they excellently described passion without rhyme, therefore rhyme was not capable of describing it.⁵⁸

The second objection does not cause any difficulty to Dryden. He dismisses it by pointing out that the Elizabethans have exhausted nearly every possibility of drama, and verse is the way "they have only left free to us". Besides having arrived at a stage in which writing verse is the only way, they have also reached a higher standard of competence than any other age. Neander's remark that "our age is arrived to a perfection in [rhyme] which they never knew" is not without reason. Dryden believes that "the genius of every age is different", and the genius of the Restoration is rhyme.⁵⁹ Moreover, the language of his age shows a remarkable progress towards refinement for which the king is partly responsible. An improvement of "our wit, language, and conversation" makes it possible for the Restoration age to pursue the line of its specialty.

The first objection involves more complex matter. It is an offshoot of the perpetually unresolved argument on the true meaning of nature, and the imitation of it. Howard's attitude is uncompromisingly naturalistic: "a Play will still be supposed to be a Composition of several Persons speaking ex tempore, and 'tis as certain that good Verses are the hardest things that can be imagin'd to be so spoken."⁶⁰ Thus rhyme is unacceptable in the play because it is not in any way near "the nature of that which it represents". Dryden's standpoint

is different. It is not whether rhyme can adequately mirror everyday conversation without distortion that constitutes the question. He is concerned with which particular medium of expression is most proper for the subject on which he writes. As we have seen before, to follow nature means to Dryden to imitate the Platonic ideal in an endeavour to create a beauty more perfect than the actually existing copies of the ideas this world of shadows can show. As the realm of tragedy lies in the "minds and fortunes of noble persons", it should have as its medium of expression an exalted language in accordance with its elevated nature. The Heroic couplet is the answer. According to Dryden, it is "nearest nature, as being the noblest kind of modern verse." If verse gives the dialogue an impression of premeditation and is therefore unnatural, it is not logical to conclude that by extension, sudden thoughts cannot be expressed in verse, "since those thoughts are such as must be higher than nature can raise them without premeditation."⁶¹ Rhyme can be guilty indeed of unnaturalness when the word order is twisted to suit the metre, or peculiar words chosen to chime in with the rhyme. So long as there is "an election of apt words, and a right disposing of them", rhyme is perfectly natural. Dryden also suggests some method to make rhyme natural--by which he now means ordinary, spontaneous conversation. Breaks in a hemistich, and running the sense of one line into another are all helpful means to make rhyme "appear as loose and free as nature."

A great part of Dryden's argument for rhyme is strongly neo-classical in outlook. One of the claims he makes for rhyme is that it "bound[s] and circumscribe[s] the fancy".⁶² The stricter form of rhyme necessitates that the poet write with more deliberation and judgment, so that instead of flying away with his imagination, the poet takes care to infuse sense into his verse in such a way that "the rhyme shall naturally follow [the words], not they the rhyme."⁶² This coincides with the tendency in the neo-classic age to emphasize that poetry should consist of matter--preferably moral in substance--for the instruction of mankind.

Equally important, and sometimes even more important than instruction, is delight, which sends the moral home to the public with engaging and pleasant appeal. It is for this reason of delight, Dryden recounts, that "the Ancients...wrote tragedies in verse, though they knew it most remote from conversation."⁶³ For Dryden, he would be satisfied even if verse causes delight without its attendant merits.

Another advantage of rhyme--probably in answer to Milton's condemnation that rhyme is not a "true ornament of Poem" and that it is the "invention of a barbarous age, to set off wretched matter and lame meeter [sic]"--is that of weeding superfluous thoughts: "to retrench the superfluities of expression" and "to bring forth the richest and clearest thoughts."⁶⁴

Even though Dryden finds the best justification for rhyme in

the example of the epic poets and European tragedies, notably French, Italian and Spanish, he realizes the restrictions of rhyme under which a poet has to work. As early as the publication of the "Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Dryden tells Lord Buckhurst that writing scenes in verse is "troublesome and slow". By 1670, in the "Preface to Tyrannic Love", Dryden declares that he has not observed "the equality of numbers in my verse; partly by reason of my hast^e, but more especially because I would not have my sense a slave to syllables."⁶⁵ When he finally rejects rhyme in All for Love (1677), it is because rhyme is too cumbersome for his purpose. His object in trying "this bow of Ulysses" is to write a play more actable than Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra, more dramatic than Daniel's Cleopatra, and more popular than his contemporary Sedley's Antony and Cleopatra. In doing so he has much to attend to: the choice of material, theme, and characterization besides expression. While it is not preposterous to say that Dryden's present purpose "is to demonstrate to critics who have disputed his theories and attacked his practices that he can reverse his stand both on the rules and on verse and still excel",⁶⁶ it can also be said that he has come to realize, not without bitterness, that Restoration poets have reached rhyme's exhaustion point just as the Elizabethans had with their blank verse--only much sooner. Besides, the heroic couplet, for all its associations with authority and its popularity, is too stiff for the stage. Its pithy antitheses are not flexible enough to allow variations of pace or

stress to suit the changes of emotions. However, in returning to blank verse after the discipline of rhyme, Dryden is able to handle the medium with precision and express himself economically.

The alignment with the epic and the moral emphasis of the neo-classic age tend to create a unique ethos for the Heroic Tragedy. As an epic in dramatic form, it should fulfil the epic end of teaching a moral lesson useful to the state, and portraying noble heroes to serve as examples of conduct. The neo-classic age gives this function a renewed emphasis. Hobbes is among one of the many to ascribe to the poets the work of averting men "from vice and inclin[ing] them to vertuous and honourable actions."⁶⁷ Dryden's idea is more precise, for his concept of art does not stop at its being a means of instruction. It is also a conditioning influence, moving the readers to practise the virtue until it becomes a habit:

The shining quality of an epic hero, his magnanimity, his constancy, his patience, his piety...raises first our admiration; we are naturally prone to imitate what we admire; and frequent acts produce a habit.⁶⁸

The process is replete with all the ramifications of religion:

By the harmony of words we elevate the mind to a sense of devotion, as our solemn music... does in churches; and by the lively images of piety, adorned by action, through the senses allure the soul; which while it is charmed in a silent joy of what it sees and hears, is struck at the same time with a secret veneration of things celestial, and is wound up insensibly into the practice of that which it admires.⁶⁹

Around this moral orientation evolve those theories which help to mould the Heroic Tragedy into what it is.

The primary aim of instruction makes the delineation of "patterns of exact virtues" the first obligation of the playwright. Goodness is often stretched to the absolute or the ideal so that the characters can really move or impress the audience. Such an attempt invites two dangers in the characterization--stagnation and abstraction. Ideal goodness in the age of Dryden moves along the personal and the social planes, but it is always by the sanction of the society, projected through the king and the parents, against a personal indulgence that one's virtue is tested. Self sacrifice is invariably the rule. Almahide has to reject a more worthy love from Almanzor to be true to her promise and to her father; Indamora^a has to suppress her love for Aureng-Zebe to save him from the jealousy of his father and king; both Ozmyn and Benzayda have to sacrifice their lives to remove the hate between their despotic fathers and to effect a true reconciliation through the consummation of their love. Such indeed is the "pattern" of virtue. Dryden stresses its importance in the "Preface to Tyrannic Love" (1670): "Patterns of piety, decently represented...may be of excellent use to second the precepts of our religion."⁶⁹ What has resulted more prominently from this is the stereotyped reaction to a given situation, the repeated conflict between self interest and an impersonal demand of one's duty. The variations within this framework are small, and

the course of action of the virtuous is almost identical--a supreme effort to inspire and to convert. They have little to add to their personality when they finally emerge from their conflict. That the word "pattern" contains connotations of the universal is evident from Dryden's effort to remove singularities of behaviour from his virtuous characters to the extent that their personalities are almost interchangeable. Melesinda is simply virtue personified. One tends to think of her in terms of abstract qualities--constancy, faithfulness, dedication...

Virtue left suffering in the hands of injustice would lose all its meaning and efficacy in instructing mankind. The neo-classic moralists believe that there is no better way to preach that virtue is worth embracing than to show that it always triumphs over vice. Thus they want to make sure that virtue is properly rewarded and vice punished, not in the life to come, but here and now. Dryden endorses this view almost without reservation. He believes that this is how tragedy functions: "the punishment of vice and reward of virtue are the most adequate ends of tragedy because the most conducing to good examples of life."⁷⁰ The neo-classic age is well pleased with the moral climate of its tragedies. In fact, the neo-classicists deem that it is this moral emphasis that raises neo-classical tragedies above the Greek tragedies, which, "instead of punishing vice and rewarding virtue, ...have often shown a prosperous wickedness, and an unhappy piety."⁷¹ Corneille echoes the same

feeling. Talking about Sophocles, he points out that "the punishment of evil actions, and reward of good ones was not the usage of his century as we have made it ours."⁷²

This moralistic ethos of the Heroic Tragedy makes Aristotle's pity and fear no longer adequate. The sight of virtue in ultimate triumph evokes wonder and admiration more than fear. The need for pity is eliminated. The heroes and their feats of honour call rather for "concernment". In the "Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Dryden writes that the poet should "stir up a pleasing admiration and concernment, which are the objects of a tragedy."⁷³ This alteration in the effect of tragedy is significant. Aristotle's pity and fear work at man's primary instincts of attachment and flight, and the attitude of the audience is conditioned by the play to be semi-detached. Admiration and concernment of the Heroic Tragedy, however, compel a closer participation on the part of the audience, and encourage identification with the *dramatis personae*. The aim of admiration is more creative than fear. Rather than refraining from not doing what leads to calamity, admiration implies an urge to imitate what one aspires to.

So far all the aspects of tragedy that Dryden has chosen for the Heroic Tragedy are the best in theory--equal proportions of action and passion; a set of flexible rules to give form to the imagination; elevated themes and characters attended by equally elevated expression--all directed to the noble end of the instruction

of mankind. Whether these did succeed to produce the kind of drama Dryden expects remains to be seen. Since Dryden seldom takes the trouble, as Corneille does, to analyze his own plays, it is my intention to examine them in the next chapter in the light of his theories.

- CHAPTER II -

- THE STRUCTURE OF THE HEROIC TRAGEDIES -

The Conquest of Granada is followed by a sequel, and the tremendous expansion of the scope of the play thus effected lends it a grandiosity at the epic scale. On closer examination, however, the play does not range over a vast expanse of time and place as a "conquest" usually suggests in an epic. Part I and Part II tell of the adventures that take place in two separate days, though a long enough period has elapsed between the reluctant and bitter farewell of Almanzor and the renewed crisis that precipitates an imminent demand for his return to Granada. In Part I, Boabdelin closes the play by sighing relief to an eventful day that nearly robbed him both of his crown and his queen:

Let war and vengeance be tomorrow's care;
But let us to the temple now repair;
A thousand torches make the mosque more bright:
This must be mine and Almahide's night.¹

Part II has no explicit references to the passage of time, possibly because the multifarious actions depicted have prompted Dryden to follow Corneille's advice more closely: that an illusion of twenty-four hours can be achieved in a play in which the action demands more simply by not mentioning the time. The place of action shifts from the palace to the Alhambra and from the Albayzyn to the Spanish camp, which, according to Crites, "may all be comprehended under the larger denomination of one place"--Granada.

So far due respects have been paid to the structure of the unities, and the play would have been praised for its classical beauty had not its action and characterization dismayed the critics by their very aberration from classical taste and decorum. The imprint of Elizabethan diversity and altiloquence is obvious--so obvious that many classical stage contrivances as reports, choral devices, and messengers, besides the observance of the two unities already mentioned, pass almost unnoticed. Dryden's preservation of these "romantic" features is intentional, because they suit his purpose. What he proposed to examine in the play are excess and intemperance--not only their destructive, but also their constructive aspects. Qualifications like "ambitious", "passionate", and "powerful" are almost always ambiguous. Ambition can mean aspiration but also covetousness; passion can mean strong affection but also appetite; power can mean authority but also tyranny. Most of the characters find themselves in an oscillating scale. It is too easy to stay in the extremes--either in Dionysiac frenzy or in Apollonian serenity. To maintain a balance when true beauty emerges from an imposition of Apollonian light and order on Dionysiac fertility and luxuriance is, as instanced by Aschenbach in Mann's Death in Venice, almost impossible. Perhaps Dryden is trying this himself in the composition of the play, by allowing the romantic material to be ordered, but not absorbed, by the unities. At any rate, as Dryden projects the theme through the style, it suggests an intimate relation between structure

and substance.

Violence is spilled onto the stage as the curtain goes up. Granada is torn by invasion from without and political strife from within. The rival factions, swords unsheathed, press the king to administer justice, which is one of the many things ^{of} ~~to~~ which the king is incapable. Almanzor steps forward, and, without making inquiries, takes the side of the Abencerrages and kills Gomel in a scuffle. The implication and outcome of this scene are revealing. The war and internal unrest denote a balance gone awry, when an indulgence in hate is allowed unchecked. Verbal exchanges between the factions build up the tension until a flash of the sword, no matter where it comes from, releases the torrent of hatred and unleashes bloodshed. In such an orgy of enmity and bloodthirstiness, Boabdelin's pleading and begging reflect not his wisdom but rather his inanity in using reason to persuade unreason. His indecision because of unwillingⁿness to offend conveys no justice, but weakness-- he is an impotent king bewildered by strife. Almanzor supplies the answer by a show of force and an authoritative command, which, for all its intemperance, surpasses irresolution and cowardly weakness in a kingly office. The contrast of excess-weakness-excess does not stop here. Almanzor's power, however, is without any moral dimension--

I cannot stay to ask which cause is best;
But this is so to me, because opprest--

or bearing on society:

My laws are made only for my sake.²

This borders on, and in fact is not much different from, tyranny or anarchy, which completes the circle and returns to the same state in which the rival factions find themselves. Almanzor has either to balance his unsanctioned power by admittance of moral law, or

By your own law I take your life away.

In this scene, Dryden exploits the paradox of power. Dubiety in the name of reason is weakness, while undue assumption of authority is anarchy. How to reach the middle position is the question.

Almanzor's titanic self sufficiency to the point of exorbitance is accompanied by bombast and rant, which breaks even the bounds of the heroic couplet by which Dryden hopes to elevate nature. This is reinforced by recurring images to depict nature run wild. Almanzor's description of himself is sustained on these two levels:

I am as free as nature first made man,
Ere the base law of servitude began,
When wild in woods the noble savage ran.³

Almahide sums Almanzor up in a nutshell: he is "unfashioned nature"-- a state in which the useful and the useless exist in equal luxuriance and lavishment^{ness}. She is quick to detect both of them immediately:

Mark but how terribly his eyes appear!
And yet there's something roughly noble there.⁴

His magnanimity has already been shown in his release of the Duke of Arcos, though his ultimate aim is to satisfy his heroic whim of capturing him again.

Almanzor is not alone in this state of excess. Boabdelin, Abdalla, Zulema, Abenamar, Selin and Lyndaraxa have all indulged in one form of Dionysiac release or another. Almanzor's condition is thus illuminated by comparison and contrast from different angles. Boabdelin confronts Almanzor in Act I and again in Act V of Part I. The uninspiring king has by his defensive rather than aggressive attitude invited disintegration of his kingdom, and has to rely on a stranger to preserve his throne. He is a mere show of a defunct monarchy which he claims not by power but by right. His actions betray a mean and petty heart. Never having experienced any conquests, he finds the captured Duke of Arcos too precious to be released. Never having gained anything by virtue of his own merit, he sees the intrusion of Almanzor a dangerous threat to his possession of Almahide. Love to him is another form of commodity given him by right, and he extends this pragmatic philosophy of life to Almanzor, thinking that one commodity can substitute for another.

The blood, which you have shed in her defence,
 Shall have in time a fitting recompence:
 Or, if you think your services delayed,
 Name but your price, and you shall soon be paid.⁵

Though Almanzor's love is naturalistic, he is capable of "exalted passion" which prompts him to lose Almahide in freedom rather than to own her by force. This, which he calls "the excess of love" throws into sharp relief the petty jealousy of Boabdelin, who, in Part II, has relented all his duty to the state to nurse his fits of animosity and wreck the peace of Almahide for giving a scarf to

Almanzor.

Abdalla is perhaps the only one who knows the necessity, and ironically, the difficulty of balance. The love of Lyndaraxa is anarchic. To possess her he has to dispossess himself of reason and justice which make him a social being. The ideal compromise between the two extremes is impossible and like Aschenbach he chooses to stay in the midst of corruption, to feed on illusion, and to await his death. Like all those who have exposed themselves to intemperance, Abdalla becomes a slave of his own choice. Calling himself a "sceptred slave", he reviews his own sad situation:

Under how hard a law poor lovers live!
Who, like the vanquished, must their right release,
And with the loss of reason buy their peace.⁶

Yet, because he makes the choice in spite of his full understanding of its nature, he is able to rise above Boabdelin, Zulema, and Lyndaraxa by being totally committed to it.

When I usurped a crown for love of you,
I then did more than, dying, now I do.
I'm still the same as when my love begun;
And, could I now this fate foresee or shun,
Would yet do all I have already done.⁷

Lyndaraxa's indiscriminate wooing of power is as strong as Almanzor's compulsion for glory. But instead of regulating the passion by reason and accepting responsibilities, she revels in the drunken sensation of being on the top of the world and having others under her domination. Her idea of power is but a naïve dream compounded of glamour, attention, and complete freedom:

Abd. Why would you be so great?

Lyn. Because I've seen,

This day, what 'tis to hope to be a queen.--

Heaven, how you all watched each motion of her eye!

None could be seen while Almahide was by,

Because she is to be--Her Majesty!

Why would I be a queen? Because my face⁸

Would wear the title with a better grace.

Furthermore, to be a queen means absolute happiness. It is in feeding persistently on this illusion without ever being awakened to the reality of Boabdelin's insecurity as a king and Almahide's bondage as a queen that Lyndaraxa's character is ultimately simple. Blinded by her passion she dies with a childlike satisfaction in having her guards bow to her in submission.

Lyndaraxa's vacillation from Abdelmelech to Abdalla and eventually to the Spaniard contrasts and illuminates Almanzor's notorious practice of changing sides. Lyndaraxa is motivated purely by her desire to advance and she needs no moral scruples to make her decisions. She would accept love from Abdalla as a king as soon as "from any other man" who is able to make her queen. Almanzor, however, changes not only because Boabdelin and Abdalla are ungrateful but also because he is prevented from executing his promise. When Boabdelin refuses to release the Duke of Arcos, he has, to Almanzor, "[broken] my promise and absolve[d] my vow!" and that is "more than Mahomet himself can do!" The total absence of moral sensibility has made evil Lyndaraxa's only course of action. Power and fortune are her goals and she is ready to court them with all her wiles, art and cunning.

At the other end of the scale, full of control and restraint, are Almahide, Benzayda and Ozmyn--the "patterns of exact virtues" which Dryden believes can challenge the best of the French. It is easy to live at this extreme just as it is easy to live at the other. But when the two confront each other, as when Almahide meets Almanzor, restraint is shaken and she feels that her peace is shattered.

How blessed was I before this fatal day,
 When all I knew of love, was to obey!
 'Twas life becalmed, without a gentle breath;
 Though not so cold, yet motionless as death.⁹

Now faced with a fiery love that knows no bounds, she realizes that "love, all strife,/All rapid, is the hurricane of life." Her encounter with Almanzor is creative as each unconsciously brings out the best from the other. The first sight of Almahide inspires "something noble" in Almanzor and he decides "nobly [to] lose her in her liberty." This act is different from the one he uses to the Duke of Arcos, for it involves self sacrifice rather than self gratification--"I dare be wretched, not to make her so." In the Second Part, it is out of respect for Almahide's virtues that he surrenders his desires and aims at self restraint. Just as Almanzor's demands create an intense conflict within her and help her realize the reality of passion as well as the necessity of honour. Her answer to Almanzor reveals the result of the conflict: "Yet think that I deny myself, not you."¹⁰

Benzayda and Ozmyn complete the character contrast that is integral in the play. Pious, faithful, charitable, they are the direct

opposites of the values of Lyndaraxa. Just as Lyndaraxa becomes a metaphor of vice and greed, so are Benzayda and Ozmyn the metaphor of absolute virtue. Lyndaraxa demoralizes all those who are enamoured by her charm. Benzayda and Ozmyn set out to convert, dispel hatred, and implant love.

The complexity of the plot is increased by another set of contrasts--the contrasts of love relationships. Within the "eternal quadrangle" of Almahide, Boabdelin, Almanzor, and Zulema alone, contrast is afforded for different kinds of love: love not sanctioned by true affection but by legality; love that borders on appetite but is refined by restraint and constancy; and love that is founded on lust alone. What makes the three love relationships of Almahide-Almanzor, Lyndaraxa-Abdalla, and Benzayda-Ozmyn so different from one another is the influence of the woman concerned. Dryden emphasizes that influence by making men unwitting victims of their love or passion. Almanzor is able to aim at balancing his excessive passion by Almahide's example. Abdalla has to sink lower and lower to meet the excessive demands of Lyndaraxa. Only to Benzayda and Ozmyn, love is an enriching experience, a bond that not only binds the two to themselves but also to their families and their society.

Further contrast of the love relationships is brought about by the juxtaposition of the love scenes. Almanzor meets Almahide in Act II, the middle of Part I, just after Abdalla has surrendered his reason in the name of love. Almanzor's course is upward rather than

downward. His titanic passion, naturalistic as it may be, recognises a superior element in Almahide's temperance, which inspires him to redirect his heat:

This raging fire, which through the mass does move;
Shall purge my dross, and shall refine my love.¹¹

The love of Ozmyn and Benzayda develops in Act IV, Scene ii, after Abdalla has made the choice of Satan: "Evil be thou my good." He has become Lyndaraxa's puppet. Ozmyn and Benzayda carry love to the spiritual level. It is virtue that sparks their fire. The bravery of Ozmyn and the "noble pity" of Benzayda underscore the extreme materialism of the Lyndaraxa-Abdalla relationship.

The central action of the play is described by its title and subtitle: "The Conquest of Granada" and "Almanzor and Almahide." The two illuminate each other, and the heroics of the hero are given full display. War discloses the might of Almanzor that love does not, while love exposes his self sacrificial spirit that war does not. The final victory of Spain is symbolic not necessarily of the triumph of Christianity, but the permanence and humanism of Christian virtues--mercy, justice, and sympathy--that are found and practised generously in the Spanish camp.

The whole play is based on contrasts, from character to love relationships to countries, and Dryden's method is to show these contrasts diagrammatically. Yet the scheme is not without that subtlety which makes Dryden a brilliant satirist. Lyndaraxa's dream version of a king free from all obligations is ironically contrasted by the

piteous picture of a true king, "that weathercock of state", who laments that "equally I dread/Almanzor living and Almanzor dead!" The moral of the satire is found in Ferdinand and Isabella: that power is not glory but a happy mixture of authority and clemency.

At this point we can perhaps ponder over the question of how far Dryden has followed his own theories. When he was examining the Silent Woman, he praised Jonson's technique of introducing the main character or humour onto the stage. Jonson, he said, "recommends [the character or humour] to your observation by a pleasant description of it before the person first appears", so that "you have a longing expectation of [either of] them."¹² This is exactly how he manoeuvres the entrance of Almanzor. When the play opens, the king and his courtiers are not holding emergency meetings discussing matters of state, but recounting and admiring the bravery and horsemanship of a stranger who easily excels the bravest youth of Granada. So magnetic is his presence that even the bull is awed. By emphasis at the same time upon the unknown identity of this hero, his entrance is eagerly awaited. The veil of mystery about him is not lifted until Abdalla hurries onto the stage, and prevents the execution of the stranger by announcing that he is Almanzor, their saviour-to-be.

I have already commented that the profusion of violence on the stage is used as a visual metaphor to project the excess of emotions indulged for their own sakes. Emotional disorders find their "objective correlative" in external physical disorders. Dryden's use of

violence here, however, is different from Webster's. He does not see, as Webster does, that it is a world gone mad and the people are turning it into a living grave. Final order is forthcoming together with redemption. By the time the duel is fought and the dying villain is repentant (Part II, Act V, Sc. ii) the world is ready for regeneration. The final tumult that ends the precarious existence of Granada is not represented but recounted by the Duke of Arcos, who has not only won a victory but also regained a son. In doing thus, Dryden is true to his own theory. "A mean betwixt" both violence and narration should be struck, and his attempt in the Conquest of Granada is a happy one, because it suits the larger purpose of the play.

In Aureng-Zebe, Dryden is searching for another form of expression.¹³ The subject matter, as all the critics are quick to point out, is still within the heroic play formula that the Conquest of Granada has adopted. The theme is very much the same--how the intemperate indulgence of passions by persons in power has resulted in widespread turmoil, and how order and growth are made possible only through the marriage of courage and restraint. Unlike the Conquest of Granada, Aureng-Zebe does not seek to externalize its internal disorders, either in violence or in bombast and rant. There is an obvious tendency to project these in images, to depend more on the possibilities of language than on action. The ten acts and the numerous scenes of the Conquest of Granada are compressed to five acts without any subdivisions, showing what Crites called the last

leg of the race--the resurgence of the Indian Empire from her ruins.

The chorus-like opening makes the condensation possible. In fact, the first two lines circumscribe the length of time.

Heaven seems the empire of the east to lay
On the success of this important day:¹⁴

The Omrahs wait in apprehension for the advent of the struggle and "servilely from fate expect a king", while they recapitulate the genesis of the convulsion--the decline of power in an amoral climate which invites a diabolic race for the throne among the heirs. All but Aureng-Zebe seek to seize the Crown. On this virtuous and loyal son depend the fate of the Emperor and the peace of the nation. The war for power and the excision of the usurpers constitute the enveloping action of the play. This is not the main action just as the rotting of Denmark and her fluctuating relation with Norway are not the main action of Hamlet. Dryden prepares the hint in the speech of Solyman about Aureng-Zebe:

To vast rewards may well his courage move,
A parent's blessing, and a mistress' love.
If he succeed, his recompence, we hear,
Must be the captive queen of Cassimere.¹⁵

This is followed immediately by the entrance of the Emperor himself and he engineers the first crisis by confessing that he is in love with Indamora, the main "reward" that Aureng-Zebe is after. When Aureng-Zebe returns in victory and finds a hostile father and a lover unable to love, the conflict is complete.

Dryden can indeed boast of classical economy and poignancy in

Act I. In succession the scene of the action is laid and pertinent materials are interwoven to bring the central conflict to a head. The method is compendious in such a way that the same act of the Conquest of Granada pales in comparison. In the latter play Dryden is deliberately expanding his scope to make room for a parallel development of the hero's love and heroism. The purpose of the First Act is to inform and maximize our admiration for Almanzor's exceptional qualities. We have to wait till the third Act when the appearance of Almahide completes his character.

In Aureng-Zebe, once the groundwork is erected, Dryden shows his favour of English variety by involving as many people with this eternal triangle as possible. As if inspired by the Emperor, Arimant suddenly finds that he possesses a similar passion for Indamora. Nourmahal is hopelessly attracted to Aureng-Zebe, and even Melesinda is sucked into the maelstrom when Morat sees the eyes of the captive queen and is struck. The complication thus effected allows Dryden to explore not simply the different attitudes to love as he had done already in the case of Almahide. When the rivals are at once father and son, king and subject\$, the affair involves implications that cannot be explained by the values of love alone. Wherever the lovers turn, they are faced with the larger issues of responsibility, duty, allegiance, and honour. As head of the family and the country, the Emperor is abdicating from his public and private responsibilities when he seeks to renew his "warmth" in illicit love. In turning against his

father and his brother for the hand of a woman, Morat has sinned against the natural law. In harbouring a promiscuous love for her step-son, Nourmahal has violated her role as mother and wife. The position of Aureng-Zebe and Indamora is to find and sustain a justifiable code of conduct in an immoral world--a world where fortune is deified, wars justified, and power glorified. Arimant reflects the general attitude of permissiveness when he checks Asaph Khan from calling the princes "Rebels and Parricides":

Brand not their actions with so foul a name:
 Pity at least what we are forced to blame.
 When death's cold hand has closed the father's eye,
 You know the younger sons are doomed to die.
 Less ills are chosen greater to avoid,
 And nature's laws are by the state's destroyed.
 What courage tamely could to death consent,
 And not, by striking first, the blow prevent?
 Who falls in fight, cannot himself accuse,
 And he dies greatly, who a crown pursues.¹⁶

It is this air that breeds the Saturnalian pursuit of carnality by the Emperor and Nourmahal, and of "greatness" by Morat. The design of the play shows that Dryden's intention is to trace the movement of the "Grand Passions". This is evident from the fact that there is only one continuous plot--the plot of love.

The ruling weakness of Aureng-Zebe's persecutors is indulgence. Like Lear, the Emperor seeks to revive his waning power and energy by proffering his empire at random, and in addition by loving the mistress of his son. Unlike Lear, he is fully conscious of his own folly and the result of his act; but, in spite of "Virtue, disdain, despair, I oft have tried", he makes no persistent effort to pull himself back

from the abyss. His quarrel with Nourmahal is significant, because it marks his complete abandonment of pretences to virtue. The order to arrest his wife opens the last gate to unrestrained indulgence of his passion and he sets out to remove anything that may cross his path of love. Aureng-Zebe is offered and deprived of a crown at the same time, and the Emperor prepares his own degradation when he turns it over to Morat, knowing full well that "Morat's design a doubtful meaning bears;/In Aureng-Zebe true loyalty appears" but still insisting that "love less bears a rival than the throne." Like Lear, he does not have to wait long for his turn of disillusionment. The power that he has conferred on Morat proves his own undoing. The gift of power is seldom reciprocated by love out of gratitude, and Morat's retort is much more piercing and crushing than even a Goneril or a Regan would give. His position, he says, is "Not of a son, but of an Emperor", because

You cancelled duty when you gave me power,
 If your own actions on your will you ground,
 Mine shall hereafter know no other bound.
 What meant you when you called me to a throne?
 Was it to please me with a name alone?¹⁷

The key of Morat's temper, like the key word of his speech, is "will", which is more unfettered inclination than determination. His prime objective is to crave for "Renoun and fame,/And power, as uncontrolled as is my will." As Indamora is quick to perceive, this "lust of power" and the inability to discriminate between "desires of good and ill" has "let loose the unbridled mind", which is noxiously

anti-social. Any social obligations as filial duty and patriotic allegiance have no place in his power-glory philosophy which echoes the theory of a whole line of advocates of the unscrupulous--Machiavelli, Richard III, Edmund, and Tamburlaine. There is perhaps a gleam of Hobbes and, not surprisingly, even of Darwin when Morat rants:

But who by force a Sceptre does obtain,
Shows he can govern that which he could gain.
Right comes of course, whate'er he was before,
Murder and usurpation are no more.¹⁸

In the state of nature, there is virtue in power for it proves physical superiority which alone qualifies existence. Thus Morat has no compunction in eradicating his father's enfeebled reign and advancing his control by aggravating and exploiting Aureng-Zebe's degradation. "What power makes mine, by power I mean to seize" is the "moral" of his world.

His attitude towards possessing Indamora is connatural. He is the ideal lover because the qualities he possesses such as "youth and fortune" are substantial, while his father is "An emperor and lover, but in show". By virtue of this alone he is justified to shove his father out of his claim for Indamora just as he is justified to shove him out of his throne:

If you have not enjoyed what youth could give,
But life sunk through you, like a leaky sieve,
Accuse yourself, you lived not while you might
But, in the captive queen resign your right.
I've now resolved to fill your useless place;

I'll take that post, to cover your disgrace,
And love her, for the honour of my race.¹⁹

As such, Morat is the only one who does not suffer any conflict, as Indamora warned him he would, aroused by his conscience. It is easy for him to get rid of it:

If mirth should fail, I'll busy her with cares,
Silence her clamorous voice with louder wars.

Nourmahal shares the same arrogance with her son. Her reason enables her to have a genuine admiration for Aureng-Zebe's temperance, valour, and nobleness, "that man, that godlike man, so brave, so great", but is too weak to withstand a passion that is ready to defy anything in order to find gratification. Her philosophy of life is a hedonistic pursuit of changing desires:

'Tis not for nothing that we life pursue;
It pays our hopes with something still that's new:
Each day's a mistress, unenjoyed before;
Like travellers, we're pleased with seeing more.
Did you not know what joys your way attend,
You would not hurry to your journey's end.²⁰

Just as Morat's power-oriented ethic recognizes strength rather than propriety, Nourmahal's passion recognizes pleasure rather than morals. That her step-son should be the object of her love poses no difficulty for her, because "Promiscuous love is Nature's general law". In the same way, her fury knows no discrimination. Morat has chosen the wrong time to interfere with her desire to poison Aureng-Zebe, and she is determined to be revenged, what though he be her son?

In my swollen breast my close revenge, I'll keep;
I'll watch his tenderest part and there strike deep.²¹

She raises an army without fail when Morat lays seige to the Citadel, and accomplishes her promise when her soldiers wound Morat fatally.

In the midst of such diabolical, aberrant behaviour, the role of Aureng-Zebe and Indamora is to define and assert the relevance of restraint, the value of conscience, and the efficacy of honour as basic social structures. Indamora's guidance is consistent. Her approach is to extract that small quantity of good concealed in a few but inherent in all human beings and to set out to "enlarge" it. Arimant is made to recognize his own worth in valour, truth and kindness, and Morat begins to sense the "distant prospect of a shore" of virtue when he realizes that his soul is great, though irregular. Even to Aureng-Zebe, she is an enlightenment. She cautions him in his heat of anger against his father not to lose "the honour you have early won/But stand the blameless pattern of a son." A "calm harbour" herself, she is exempted from the vital conflicts that shake her suitors and her rival at one time or another, and though the plot revolves around her she is emotionally distanced from the others. The only discord she experiences is in the beginning when she struggles to refrain from doing an act that will harm Aureng-Zebe both ways--to tell him that his father is his rival. Aureng-Zebe's unfounded jealousy also ruffles her calm, but, bitter though she may be, she cannot but choose to follow the only way--the assertion of her dignity by being wronged rather than to beg for reconciliation.

For Aureng-Zebe the dilemma is duty: "I to a son's and lover's

praise aspire./And must fulfill the parts which both require."

The difficulty lies not so much in resolving which to reject as how to make room for both, each demanding, in Aureng-Zebe's case, the elimination of the other. He cannot follow Corneille's heroes in always consciously and painfully choosing duty, for it is both love and honour that complete his heroic character. While each turn of the plot of the Conquest of Granada aims at building heroic qualities onto Almanzor, the plot of Aureng-Zebe is designed to test the hero for these qualities. The process is that of attrition. Aureng-Zebe is deprived of the love of his father at the outset. The love of Indamora is elusive and precarious. No sooner has he expressed hope in Morat's honour than Morat enters the scene to negate all his values and pronounce his death. And before he is allowed to seek solace in this "immortal liberty" he is to witness the annihilation of the moral world in Nourmahal's incestuous passion. All these climaxes terminate in Aureng-Zebe's shock and despair, but each helps to clarify his character. In spite of the wrongs inflicted on him and the obvious futility of virtue, his most pessimistic speech, "When I consider life, 'tis all a cheat", shows no recognition or realization that in order to live, "'tis necessary to be 'vicious'". Each set-back calls for yet another affirmation of loyalty, filial piety, and dignity. Just as the Emperor, Morat and Nourmahal pursue power and pleasure for their own sakes, Aureng-Zebe pursues virtue for its own sake. Yet for all his moral strength, he stumbles in

the test of love. Gnawed by suspicion and jealousy, out of pride, to accept any explanation. Though he comes short of trust, it is the ferocity of his jealousy that relates him to the family of pugnacious heroes as Maximin and Almanzor.

Melesinda, one with Dryden's "patterns of exact virtues", serves as a sounding board for all the characters in the love plot. The Emperor's voluptuousness and selfishness are contrasted to her dignity and selflessness. Nourmahal's promiscuousness is underlined by her chastity. The fickleness and scorn of Morat are repaid by devotion and admiration; and Aureng-Zebe's jealousy is shamed in the face of inviolable faith. Her death by fire is symbolic of the energy of her love, which she likens to "elemental fire", burning without any fuel. Another death by "fire"--Nourmahal's--is the metaphor of destructive passion. Unlike Indamora, Melesinda is a passive force which demonstrates but does not guide. Dryden himself thinks that her passivity "is not a virtue much in use."²² Thus in spite of her examples and suffering, the conversion of Morat is finally Indamora's achievement.

The play so far deals with mental turmoil and chaos which subsume the cry of war. The imminent disintegration of the empire is distant and is conveyed by images rather than by clashes of swords. In Act I, the recurrent images are built on nature running out of her normal course. The Indus and Ganges "Swell their dyed currents with their native's wounds:/Each purple river winding...". Throughout the whole country "the vale an iron harvest seems to yield,/Of

thicksprung lances in a waning field." In Agra, the capital, the politicians are expecting a "hurricane". The languishing energy of the old Emperor is referred to as the last round of nature's cycle-- "winter" and the "setting sun". The convulsions of physical nature are accompanied by horrid aberrations of social nature: parents revenging themselves on their sons, sons persecuting their parents, and all indulging in illicit love. Animal images are used to enhance the message that Dryden labours to convey: that it is a world of brutes. The Emperor calls himself "a bird of night"; and Morat gladly accepts the idea that he is the incarnation of "some bear, or lion..."

Aureng-Zebe marks the beginning of a more pronounced influence of the French theatre. Dryden's theme is passion, which is also the subject of French drama. In this he is following more closely the definition of a play he has given in the "Essay of Dramatic Poesy", that it is "a just and lively image of human nature, representing its passions and humours, and the changes of fortunes to which it is subject...".²³

It is in All for Love that Dryden carries this a little further and succeeds in making passion the action of the play. As Lisidieus says, "every new sprung passion, and turn of it, is a part of the action, and much the noblest."²⁴ This, and the use of blank verse, indicate that Dryden is expanding the scope of his dramatic career, or, as others would prefer to say, that having exhausted the Heroic Tragedy and feeling disgusted with it, he deserts his own field and

finds refuge in Shakespeare. But in view of the development of his plays, All for Love is the logical direction towards which he has been moving. Imitation of Shakespeare in the form of images and verse similarities had already appeared in Aureng-Zebe.²⁵ Besides, Aureng-Zebe had convinced him that a more stringent form does not necessarily result in a "dearth of plot and narrowness of imagination." In concentrating on the passions, he is able to extricate himself from problems arising from verisimilitude and decorum, and able to have, again in Lisidieus's words, "more Liberty for verse." One whole year has elapsed since his public admission of weariness with rhyme in the "Prologue to Aureng-Zebe", therefore that he should switch to blank verse in the next play is but natural.

Examples are not lacking to show how far All for Love has deviated from the pattern of the Heroic plays. The very choice of the fable itself brings in elements hitherto not found in the Heroic Tragedy. There is no hero, heroine or villain in the heroic sense of the words. In taking for the action of the play the last day of Antony's life, we have a hero already past his glory. He cannot rant or boast of the fierceness of his courage; he can only look back both in anger and sorrow at his share of the world gained only to be lost. He does not shoot daggers with his eyes; instead, tears well up at each show of loyalty, generosity, and self effacement. The saintly, angelic heroine is taken over by Cleopatra who languishes in love and tells her beloved to "stay. If you must perish--". The villain,

if Alexas can be called a villain, seeks for self preservation rather than self aggrandisement. He is more piteous than villainous when he says

O that I less could fear to lose this being,
Which, like a snowball in my coward hand,
The more 'tis grasped, the faster melts away.
.....
..... Let me think:
What can I say, to save myself from death?
No matter what becomes of Cleopatra.²⁶

There can be no happy ending as this part of history is too well known. And as Dryden is bent on portraying the mental war of two opposing passions, sudden reversals of fortune are ruled out.

Critics therefore conclude that the play belongs to "Tragedy" rather than "Heroic" Tragedy. However, we have no clue as yet to the fact that Dryden is keenly conscious that he is writing what we think a purer kind of tragedy. As in his other heroic tragedies, love is the main subject of All for Love. Dryden evidently thinks that love is a "heroic passion". Thus the play does not lack heroic issues. In fact, according to Waith, love is presented in such a way that it "becomes a suitable enterprise for a hero."²⁷

What Dryden is doing in All for Love is not so much presenting a tremendous conflict of love and honour per se, as communicating worlds of different values. The world of public values places a premium on duty, efficiency, personal glory--the world to which Ceasar belongs and the world into which Ventidius is pulling Antony back. Cleopatra embodies the world of private values, chiefly love. In this world,

the rules are constancy, devotion and esteem. Neither of these sets of values, public and private, can be arbitrarily called "bad". Both of them happen to be "bad" to each other because they are incompatible. And this is where Antony's difficulty lies.

The method that Dryden adopts to cast these two sets of values in perspective is alternate contrast--carried almost to the point of being mechanical. He is right when he says in the preface of the play that "every scene...[is] conducing to the main design, and every act conclude[s] with a turn of it."²⁸ At the end of each act, Antony is converted by one of the parties. Ventidius reaps his fruit in the First Act, therefore it is reasonably sound to expect Cleopatra to claim her spoil at the end of the Fourth as well as in the Fifth. Dryden's obsession with balance is explicit here. Roman practicality and effectiveness are offset by Egyptian luxury and shrewdness. The Roman white military toga contrasts with the Egyptian "colourful green tunic". Enervating Roman trumpets blare to the effeminate echo of Egyptian timbrels. Each character is provided (as Miranda is with Hippolito in Dryden's The Tempest) a counterpart so that they may "illustrate and commend each other". Ventidius is paired up with Alexas as the chief manipulator of Antony's mind; Octavia with Cleopatra as patronising different kinds of love; and Dolabella with Charmion as deputies, one of Antony and the other of Cleopatra.

Symmetry and balance have found their way into the dialogue as

well. Verses such as "He first possessed my person; you my love:/ Caesar loved me; but I loved Antony", and "For, if a friend, thou hast beheld enough;/And, if a foe, too much" are reminiscent of the antitheses of the heroic couplet.²⁹ The poise of many verbal exchanges gives a ritualistic effect. One example is the discourse between Antony and Octavia:

Ant. Therefore you love me not.

Oct. Therefore, my lord,
I should not love you.

Ant. Therefore you would leave me?

Oct. And therefore I should leave you--if I could.³⁰

The following example is more famous. Antony is all at once besieged by Ventidius, Dolabella, Octavia and her daughters, each with a special claim on him:

Vent. Was ever sight so moving?--Emperor?

Dol. Friend!

Oct. Husband!

Children Father!

Ant. (resignedly) I am vanquished: take me.³¹

Perhaps it is because of this explicit and over-worked balance that the play is deprived of the more subtle richness of sophisticated contrasts that the Conquest of Granada and Aureng-Zebe sometimes share. All the conflicts are centred on Antony. The other characters attend to their allotted roles without experiencing with any intensity the struggle pitched between the seemingly opposing values. This in a way confirms the fact that Dryden is bent on setting before us two sets of values, both of which are unimpeachable within their own contexts. Ventidius at Celicia, in fact anywhere, is the epitome of

public virtues. To Alexas,

A braver ^Roman never drew a sword;
Firm to his prince, but as a friend, not slave.
He ne'er was of his pleasures; but presides
O'er all his cooler hours, and morning counsels:
In short the plainness, fierceness, rugged virtue,
Of an old true-stampt Roman lives in him.³²

Yet Cleopatra's virtues, though of a different kind, are virtues in their own right. Dolabella gives an excellent evaluation of her constancy and the truthfulness of her love:

I find your breast fenced round from human reach,
Transparent as a rock of solid crystal;
Seen through, but never pierced.
(Thinking of Antony) My friend, my friend,
What endless treasure hast thou thrown away;
And scattered, like an infant, in the ocean,
Vain sums of wealth, which none can gather thence!³³

The only attitude that is truly undesirable is the one that Antony adopts in the beginning. Both love and honour have lost their hold on him, and he is lethargic, melancholic, sleeping away his time "in desperate sloth, miscalled philosophy". It is only when he starts to choose, be it love or honour, that the vigour and inner fire of the hero return. Thus when he dies "all for love", the world is well lost for him because he has affirmed something that is meaningful to him --Cleopatra's "innocence".

Of the three plays discussed, All for Love is the least limited by Dryden's obvious endorsement of Christian morality. While the Conquest of Granada and Aureng-Zebe presuppose the superiority of one set of values, All for Love provides perception into two. When Dryden said he chose the fable of Antony and Cleopatra because of the

"excellency of the moral", he was laying a trap for his future critics. The lesson of the moral, he said, was that "the chief persons represented were famous patterns of unlawful love; and their end accordingly was unfortunate." This is a misleading statement, for immediately he argued that the hero cannot be made totally vicious; he must be pitied. It is in "working the pity to a greater height", despite Dryden's complaint that the material does not allow him to, that the ambivalent attitude of the author ultimately takes shape. The love of Antony and Cleopatra is made as substantial as the glory of Caesar, its virtues as tangible as the practical virtues of Ventidius. Instead of a gross passion, love to Antony is one form of transcendent fulfilment, "above the price of kingdoms", and he affirms it by giving it his life.

Just as Dryden shows, in his critical essays and prefaces, an effort to perfect serious drama theoretically, his plays also reveal a gradual evolution. In structure, it is a movement towards order and form. It was not without satisfaction when Dryden singled out the strict observance of the unities in All for Love as one of the beauties of the play. (Chapter I, p. 17). In subject, Dryden moves from the delineation of external events as conquests and sieges to passions. The sprawling action of the Conquest of Granada enacted in ten acts and seventeen scenes is no longer adopted. Both Aureng-Zebe and All for Love are neatly contained in five acts, since much of the antecedent actions are related by a chorus-like group.

Subplots are eliminated, and so are violent actions. In this way, the plays become more compact, less chaotic, and more actable. Yet in spite of these drastic structural reductions and the change of thematic interest, Dryden's heroic tragedies do not in any way resemble French drama. His esteem for English variety is evident in the three plays discussed. Love plots are almost always intricate. Even in All for Love, Dolabella is made to intrude into the love sanctuary of Antony and Cleopatra and to precipitate a crisis. English tragedy, Dryden believes, "requires to be built in a larger compass" (Chapter I, p. 4) and as Goggin observes, he is an expert in creating a complex predicament out of a simple situation.³⁴ As he becomes more obsessed with order and form, he tends to be more schematic in presenting contrasts. In Aureng-Zebe, contrasts are made between father and sons, wives and lovers, in a more systematic way than the contrast of love relationships in the Conquest of Granada. No one can miss the deliberate balance established between the world of Rome and the world of Egypt in All for Love.

Less notable than the rejection of rhyme for blank verse in All for Love is the gradual leaning towards language to conjure up the imagination. Though Dryden stands for equal proportions of narration and representations of actions (Chapter I, p. 4), the strife, duels and wars of the Conquest of Granada become only distant reverberations in Aureng-Zebe. The decadent atmosphere overhanging the Indian Empire is maintained almost throughout by images (Chapter II, p. 52). In All

for Love, the "action" is mainly verbal as the mental dilemma of Antony is traced in detail.

Equally important in the evolution of Dryden's plays, however, are the 'heroic' heroes, whose contribution to the growth of the Heroic Tragedy is discussed in the next chapter.

- CHAPTER III -

- THE HEROIC HEROES -

It is a cliché by now to say that Dryden's heroes are different from the tragic heroes of Sophocles, Shakespeare, Ibsen and Sartre. The characteristics of the so-called heroic heroes that one immediately calls to mind are rant, bombast, superhuman martial feats, extraordinary courage and vigour, and for a time this catalogue seems to be thorough enough--but only superficially. If we are to see in the heroes only these features, we will inevitably come to Mildred Hartsock's conclusion that Dryden's heroes have no growth.¹ The most heroic of all the heroes, Almanzor, does not end the same way he begins. His progress from such boasts as "I alone am king of me" and "My laws are made only for my sake" to submission to authority-- "Live and reign,/Great Ferdinand and Isabel of Spain!" is certainly not to be described by an adjective like "static".² Even if "static" refers rather to the repetition of the same characterization, each time given a different name, the conclusion is still arbitrary. Montezuma, Maximin, Cortez and Almanzor may have much in common, but there are also plenty of differences among Almanzor, Aureng-Zebe and Antony. As with his plays, the way Dryden conceives his heroes changes and matures with his age and experience.

But no matter how differently Dryden creates his heroes, there are two common denominators that distinguish them as a group and give

them their uniqueness. The first is the vast "inner fire" which is responsible directly for the immense energy, courage, and self sufficiency of the heroes. The second is the inborn ability to perceive good and willingness to abide by it. This sets them apart from the villains, some of whom are able to appreciate virtues but are unable to practise them. Virtue and action constitute the ethics of the hero. Macbeth's dash and ambition may qualify him as a typical heroic hero, but his crime does not. Hamlet's moral considerations may place him in a more advanced position than most of Dryden's heroes at the start of the plays, but his inaction and irresolution rule him out of the heroic world of daring. The practice of externalizing the heroes' emotions other than by soliloquies also accounts for the exclusiveness of Dryden's heroes. Almanzor, for example, announces by means of asides each change of heart towards infatuation during his first encounter with Almahide. In the case of Antony, the conflict between love and honour is conveyed through arguments with the various contenders. This gives the impression that they are more analytical than philosophical.

The first impression that Almanzor gives us is his "over-boiling" courage and strength--so exceptional to Abenamar that what he does in the bull ring alone is "more than man". This is the key to Almanzor's characterization. Nearly every one of his moods reaches the superlative level. In the battle field he is "like a tempest, that outrides the wind." In social conduct he is his own master *and*

acknowledges no superiors. Love easily rouses the "fury" of his soul and he allows no obstacle to stand in his way. Almahide's engagement does not pose any difficulty. He will make fate "take a bent the other way." He is not only master of his own destiny but also of that of others. He forestalls the ruin of Abdalla "by ceasing from this hour to be thy friend." Boabdelin recognizes,

Almanzor has the ascendant o'er my fate

 He's greater than a monarch on his throne:
 Without a realm, a royalty he gains;
 Kings are the subjects over whom he reigns.³

The vitality of Almanzor's inner fire gives him the power and independence which "precarious" kings envy; but when this is nourished mainly by amoral fuel, it becomes a socially destructive force. Almanzor relies on his instinct and emotion rather than reason in choosing sides: "I cannot stay to ask which cause is best;/But this is so to me, because opprest." Friendship is enough to secure his help, and the scale of justice can easily be tipped by "kindness". Zulema is shrewd enough to perceive Almanzor's vulnerable spot and sums up where, in fact, the danger lies:

The bold are but the instruments o' the wise;
 They undertake the dangers we advise;
 And, while our fabric with their pains we raise,
 We take the profit, and pay them with praise.⁴

The word "honour" is seldom absent from Almanzor's grandiloquent speeches. As he understands it, honour is but another term for attributes of glory: military success, command over people, and a will unfettered by any deterrents. This is clear from his "long" aside

after his encounter with Almahide. Love brings "numbness" to his heart, and

Arms, and the dusty field, I less admire,
And soften strangely in some new desire;
Honour burns in me not so fiercely bright.⁵

But these do not place him in the same category as Morat, whose unruly spirit is strikingly similar to that of Almanzor at first glance. While Morat withholds himself from all moral obligations, Almanzor displays glimmerings of a latent moral sensibility which is expressed in fervently respecting his vows and promises, rendering unsolicited succour to the oppressed, and admitting his fault when he is in the wrong. The release of Almahide adds another dimension to his character. It reveals an effort of self denial and self restraint which the heroine is quick to recognize as a virtue: "You bound and freed me; but the difference is, / That show'd your valour; but your virtue this." It is by this virtue and his subsequent striving to accept larger curbs on his will that the heroic hero of "Virtus et Impera" emerges.

The growth of Almanzor is his gradual change from a primitive sort of nobility to a nobility directly related to society. Almahide is instrumental not so much in teaching him what virtue is as drawing out his natural sense of good and directing it to virtuous channels. Thus when she solicits his help to "preserve a mistress and a king", she is bringing his honour, which is synonymous with virtue to her, "to the hardest proof" because the task involves the immolation of

the self for a social cause which Almanzor does not profess, and has no need to follow. When she checks his advances of love, she opens to him the true meaning of honour:

'Tis the Conscience of an act well done,
Which gives us power our own desires to shun.
The strong and secret curb of headstrong will,
The self reward of good, and shame of ill.⁶

Lyndaraxa, ironically, also contributes to Almanzor's education by testing his love. Almanzor's stand is firm: "Yet then to change, 'tis nobler to despair". This marks an important change in Almanzor's attitude. Instead of taking pride in his freedom, he has willingly committed himself to a human bond, a bond which connects him not only to Almahide but to the society at large.

Dryden's conception of Aureng-Zebe, however, undergoes a change. He is moving away from the mould that produces Almanzor. If Aureng-Zebe rants at all, it is not to boast of his might or faculty but to convince people, especially his father, of his loyalty and devotion. If he fights at all, it is to preserve his country rather than to court fame or power. Instead of despising authority and punishing gratitude by exerting his power, he suffers in patience and waits calmly for death. It seems that Dryden creates Aureng-Zebe by extracting the opposites of some of Almanzor's heroic qualities. Instead these qualities go to Morat, who rants, defies, menaces, and sets authority at naught. Critics like Waith and Kirsch wonder whether Almanzor has been split into two, "his irregularity going to Morat, his self discipline to Aureng-Zebe."⁷ Kirsch further believes that in doing

so Dryden "irrevocably undermines the heroic ethos which had animated his earlier plays."⁸

What I wish to demonstrate is that Dryden has not weakened the hero at all. Aureng-Zebe does possess the fire and spirit that distinguish the heroic hero. Virtue and action sum up his whole course of conduct--only he has gone further and has been able to execute "virtuous action". If Aureng-Zebe's suffering is taken for passivity and, consequently, his "tragic flaw"⁹, this is to misunderstand the most important fact in his characterization. Here is a man who understands perfectly the meaning and demands of honour. To Almanzor honour means glory. To Aureng-Zebe it means duty: as a son, as a subject, and as a lover. It is in his determination to follow all these duties without compromise that his strength is greatest. Death cannot intimidate him. Vice can. Unlike Melesinda, he does not assume a passive role, indulge in "despair and debilitating self-righteousness", and let his virtues carry him to his death. He starts with persuasion, and then action. He challenges Morat to rout the forces of the other rebellious brothers and to restore the throne to their father as a pledge of filial duty. Spiritually he wins the challenge; as his father is quick to admit:

Morat's design a doubtful meaning bears,
In Aureng-Zebe true loyalty appears.¹⁰

But temporarily, he is overcome not so much by physical weakness as unwillingness to resist his father's orders.

As with all the heroic heroes, love illuminates Aureng-Zebe's character. While love shows the tenderer part of Almanzor's temperament, it fires up Aureng-Zebe's. When Indamora is seized for revealing that the Emperor is her other admirer, Aureng-Zebe's immediate reaction is to rescue her, regardless of who he is in fact fighting against:

I'll rescue her, or die.
And you, my friends, though few, are yet too brave,
To see your general's mistress made a slave.¹¹

Indamora has to remind him that he is fighting against his father's soldiers and thus violating "the honour you have early won". Though Indamora urges him to "stand the blameless pattern of a son", he cannot yield to the extent of giving up his beloved. That would be infringing the honour of love: "to after ages let me stand a shame,/ When I exchange for crowns my love or fame."

If Aureng-Zebe does have a tragic flaw, it is his excessive jealousy and pride. Indamora analyses his jealousy: "It shows the loss of what you love, you fear". It also shows his lack of trust in Indamora: and when that happens the second time, she is convinced that is "such endless jealousies your love pursue,/I can no more be fully blest than you." The only way is to part. Aureng-Zebe further impairs the situation by refusing to repent out of pride:

Go, Though thou leav'st me tortured on the rack,
'Twixt shame and pride, I cannot call thee back.
She's guiltless, and I should submit; but oh!
When she exacts it, can I stoop so low?¹²

But, typical perhaps of all the heroic heroes, fate never becomes so mean as to make a wrong irrevocable, especially when the guilty recognizes it himself. Before Aureng-Zebe "los[es] all back to fate", the Emperor enters, dragging Indamora with him. Grateful to his son for defending his throne, he resigns all his claims on love and power, thus eliminating the irreconcilable barrier between honour and love.

Morat may be the vestige of the ranting hero of Dryden's earlier plays, and the fact that he is not made the hero indicates Dryden's shift of interest. All the qualities of Morat which should have been considered heroic and noble are presented as vicious and villainous. Dryden is moving towards presenting the hero in a more sympathetic light, which culminates in the portrayal of Antony.

Many doubt whether Antony can be classified among Dryden's heroic heroes. For one thing, Dryden himself tells his spectators before the play starts to be prepared for a different kind of hero.

His hero, whom your wits his bully call,
Bates of his mettle, and scarce rants at all:
He's somewhat lewd; but a well-meaning mind;
Weeps much, fights little, but is wond'rous kind.¹³

It can be seen that this description stoops to popular interpretation of the heroic hero--by being aware only of the external manifestation of the heroic character: rant, martial ability, defiance. If the play is examined closely, one sees Dryden has managed to convey these characteristics through a more subtle method: by making Antony's contenders praise and admire him for his courage and nobleness. The

Antony in the last day of his life despairing and "crampt within a corner of the world" must certainly have lost most of the lustre and brilliance of his heroic career. But this does not mean that he is no longer a hero of the heroic calibre. Dryden has taken care to show that the inner fire of Antony is only dormant, not extinct; and it can be fanned to flame without much difficulty. This Ventidius has succeeded in doing. Having been brought round to see that he is still the cherished leader of his army, Antony promises Ventidius that

Thou shalt behold me once again in iron;
And at the head of our old troops, that beat
The Parthians, cry aloud--Come, follow me.¹⁴

Ventidius is touched. To him, Antony breathes "Another soul: Your looks are more divine,/You speak a hero, and you move a god." Antony admits that Ventidius has "fired" him and he regains "that noble eagerness of fight:" which once stimulated him towards the camp of Cassius.

The "heat" of Antony's soul has been deliberately compared at length with the "coldness" of Octavius. The spirited Antony and the enthusiastic Ventidius jokingly confirm the belief that Octavius cannot die of a fever, even if he chooses to, because "he has not warmth enough to die by that." To Antony, he is "the coldest youth on earth", deliberate and scheming. Antony is impulsive, artless and open, like Almanzor whose "heart's so plain/That man on every passing thought may look", and Aureng-Zebe who wears his loyalty and hatred for vice on his sleeve. This inner fire is also the source of Antony's

"bounteous" mind and "vast soul", which, like Almanzor's "big heart", yearns for greater freedom to demonstrate his prowess.

Antony does not lack an innate awareness of good. Ventidius tells us that "virtue's his path"; and "when his danger makes him find his fault,/Quick to observe, and full of sharp remorse." Antony knows that, as a Roman, he has not been living up to the Roman virtues of duty, efficiency and glory. And as a lover, he seems to have been shamefully cheated by Cleopatra at Actium. His remorse is genuine, and perhaps more than is necessary. Ventidius notices promptly: "You are too sensible already/Of what you've done, too conscious of your failings".

Antony's love for Cleopatra is not simply an infatuation past redemption or a sheer gratification of lust. Like his heroic predecessors, he is conscious of and esteems the virtue of his mistress--virtue in the context of love. Octavia would sacrifice herself for Antony, for duty, and Cleopatra would sacrifice herself as well, but for love. Her constancy and devotion are cardinal virtues in the world of love just as efficiency and competence are virtues in the world of duty. Antony prepares his ultimate choice by hinting that he "can ne'er be conquered but by love."

The factor which makes people dubious about Antony's "qualification" as an heroic hero is his rejection of honour in preference for love. Dryden's other heroes have been fortunate enough to be able to embrace both, made possible by a stroke of *deus ex machina*: Isabella

"gives" Almahide to Almanzor, and the Emperor offers both the crown and Indamora to Aureng-Zebe. Antony is allowed only one choice, and when he sets his love "Above the price of kingdoms", and is willing to give his life for it, he has conducted himself heroically for a 'heroic passion'.

It can be seen that there is growth in the heroes not only as individuals, but as a group. To classify them under headings as daring, virulent, tenacious, only shows part of the picture. The relation between the development of the plays and the development of the heroes is organic. As Dryden moves from the world of action to the world of passions, and from a sweeping to a more compact and more formal presentation (Chapter II, p.58), the heroes also go through a metamorphosis. Aureng-Zebe and Antony are more subdued in speech and in action than Almanzor, but they are still heroic heroes by virtue of the heroic qualities they possess (Chapter III, p.62). The characterizations of Almanzor, Aureng-Zebe and Antony also show a progress towards arousing pity other than admiration. Dryden makes it quite clear that he has tried his best to draw "the Character of Antony as favourably as Plutarch, Appian, and Dion Cassius would give me leave"¹⁵ so that Antony can be pitied for his "frailty". While Aureng-Zebe is admired for his persistent respect for his duties, we are also made to pity his sufferings for the cause of virtue. On the whole, Dryden has been faithful to his theory in portraying his heroes. In the "Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy" (1679), he says that

that the hero should neither be a villain nor a perfect character of virtue, "but there are alloys of frailty to be allowed for the chief persons, yet so that the good which is in them shall outweigh the bad...".¹⁶

- CHAPTER IV -

- CONCLUSION -

The heroic tragedies of Dryden have received more condemnation than approval in two hundred-odd years of criticism. Nearly every aspect of the genre seems to be vulnerable to dispraise. The heightening of the characters and actions which Dryden thought essential to an elevated art-form were regarded in the past and still are at the present as stiff, contrived and unnatural.¹ Rhyme started off as the centre of controversy for Dryden and his contemporaries, and it would find among critics of the present day as confirmed an enemy as Howard was. Dryden later switched to blank verse, but that portion of his poetry is insidiously compared with Shakespeare's, and the bulk of the conclusions invariably affirms that Shakespeare is the master.² More frequent is perhaps the complaint about the lack of relevance of the Heroic Tragedy to present-day society. While Hamlet, Lear, and Dr. Faustus are admired and sympathized with for virtues and faults that touch the whole of mankind, Almanzor and Aureng-Zebe seem to puzzle their readers by their heroic virtues. Even Dryden's most sympathetic critic, Bonamy Dobrée, cannot but admit that the sentiments of the Heroic Tragedy seem to be grossly out-dated.³

Recent criticism on Dryden tends to explain away the blemish of his heroic tragedies by regarding them as satire, in which

Dryden's intention is "deliberately comic".⁴ Seen in this light, the gross exaggerations of love and honour, courage and might, have a concealed purpose--to parody and ridicule the conventional psychology of love and concept of heroes. In this way, the Heroic Tragedy can be made "palatable to modern taste."⁵

What have been largely neglected in Dryden's heroic tragedies are the development of the plays as a whole, and its relationship to the development of his dramatic theories. If these are examined, we are able to see the Heroic Tragedy not as an anomaly of English drama but as an important contribution at a time when drama was dying out owing to suppression. Dryden's task was to probe for a dramatic form that would revitalize the theatre. To do this he looked back to Shakespeare, Jonson and D'Avenant; the French and the Greeks; the epic, romance and contemporary dramatic theories. His attitude in his essays, prefaces and letters is serious, and it is doubtful whether he changed, quite incongruously, to a "humorous", "ludicrous" and "comic" tone in the plays proper, as the critics who see the heroic tragedies as satires say he did.

As I have tried to show in this thesis, Dryden's plays evince a gradual but definite evolution. This evolution was brought about by new ideas he had come to endorse from time to time, and conversely, the changes in practice also prompted him to modify some of his formulated theories. The fact that it was a two-way exchange proves that Dryden was not indecisive about what he had to

do in drama, but that, as a practising playwright, he was aware of the demands of the stage and strove to improve in whatever way he could. During the few years of rest after the publication of the Conquest of Granada, Dryden came under the influence of Rapin, Le Bossu and Boileau and their formalistic interpretation of Aristotle's Poetics. It resulted in a greater emphasis on order, regularity and symmetry in structure, moderation in the characterization of the hero, and a shift from admiration to pity as the proper emotion to be raised by the Heroic Tragedy. This is significant, for while Dryden modelled the Heroic Play after the theory of the epic, he found that, in practice, he had to fall back on dramatic laws.

Yet Aureng-Zebe and All for Love show more than merely the influence of the French and the classical theatres. Though the unities, especially that of action, are more strictly observed and the heroes less vehement, the plays are distinctively English. The multiple love plots of the Conquest of Granada are followed in Aureng-Zebe by one single but highly complicated love plot to give variety to the passions. In All for Love, each act ends with an unexpected turn of event and a renewed conflict between love and glory for Antony. The heroes, in Dryden's opinion, are entirely different from the French. Almanzor, Aureng-Zebe and Antony do not act according to the "strict rules of moral virtue" and their honour and love are not "weighed by drachms and scruples." They are heroes of an exceptional calibre, yet they also possess "human

passions and frailties." In plot and characterization, therefore, Dryden is a consistent follower of his own conviction that the English play "required to be built on a larger compass."⁶

Robert Corrigan describes the trend of the Twentieth-Century drama as "the theatre in search of a fix."⁷ This epithet can well be applied to Dryden's dramatic career. While the Absurdist reacts against the traditional theatre of rationalism and naturalism by negating logic and dismissing the "word", Dryden laboured in the Seventeenth Century to give form, order and impetus to an amorphous, desultory and exhausted art form. He aligned tragedy with the epic, imposed a set of governing but flexible rules, and made moral instruction the intent of the play. He tried to "fix" the theatre by finding an answer to the question: "What is the best way to write a play?" And if he came short of it, he had nonetheless succeeded in bridging the gap between two ages, in which he was

"The first of this, and hindmost of the last."

- DRYDEN'S THEORY OF THE HEROIC TRAGEDY -

NOTES - CHAPTER I

1. The figure is not definite. Nicoll thinks that the Heroic Play proper reigns from 1664-1677. But this is largely using the career of Dryden as the yardstick. If we include Orrery's The General (1661) and Otway's Venice Preserved (1682), the period will amount to twenty-one years.
2. Dryden himself quarrelled for three years with Robert Howard over the suitability of rhyme in serious plays. The controversy started with the "Preface to Rival Ladies" (1664), continued in Howard's "Preface to Four New Plays" (1665) and Dryden's An Essay of Dramatic Poesy (1668). It was not to end until both lost their temper: Howard in the "Preface to the Duke of Lerma" (1668) and Dryden in the "Defence of the Essay" (1668). Thomas Shadwell also had a bone to pick with Dryden over whether Jonson has any wit ("Preface to the Humorists").
3. Watson, Of Dramatic Poesy, I, 85.
4. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 86. Nicoll also upholds the same idea, especially the novelty of the genre: Dryden's works are "the results of a new audience, of a new reading and playgoing public, of a new aim." Restoration Drama, 4.
5. Sherwood, Dryden's Dramatic Theory and Practice, 13.
6. Kirsch, Dryden's Heroic Drama, 5-7
7. In the "Preface to An Evening's Love" (1671), he thinks that comedy, "in its own nature, [is] inferior to all sorts of dramatic writing." Watson I, 145. In "A Parallel Betwixt Painting and Poetry" (1695) he reiterates that "tragedy is more beautiful than comedy" because from it is "derived the greater and more noble pleasure." Watson II, 193.
8. Watson I, 144, and "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", 24.
9. Hoyt Trowbridge, for example, vindicated Dryden's consistency in the "Defence of the Epilogue" (1672), in which adverse criticism of the Elizabethans is considered by various critics as M. Sherwood, G. Saintsbury, and W.E. Bohn to be diametrically op-

posite to his esteem for them in the "Essay of Dramatic Poesy".
 "Dryden's essay on the Dramatic Poetry of the Last Age", PQ.
 (1943), 240-50.

10. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 63. Paul S. Wood described the temperament of the Restoration age as "moderate conservatism", and the neo-classical movement is "conservative and restrictive, tempered by a sense of reason and moderation", which is also Dryden's outlook. "Native Elements in English Neo-Classicism", MP, (1926), 201-8.
11. "Heads of an Answer to Rymer", Watson I, 214.
12. Watson I, 230-1.
13. Noyes, Selected Dramas of John Dryden, Introduction, xi.
14. Reuben Brower, "Dryden's Epic Manner and Virgil", PMLA, (1940), 119-38.
 Rene Rapin, Reflections on the Poetics, 1674, Rymer's translation.
15. "Answer to Davenant", in J.E. Spingarn, ed., Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century, II, 55.
16. Watson I, 87; 142: "these heroic representations which are of the same nature with the epic..."; "Of Heroic Plays", 158.
17. Watson I, 87; II, 229.
18. Watson I, 158.
19. Parsons, "The English Heroic Play", MLR, (1938), 1-14.
20. Spingarn II, 68.
21. "The Poetics of Aristotle" in Adams and Hathaway, eds., Dramatic Essays of the Neoclassic Age, 123.
22. Watson I, 167.
23. "Of Ancient and Modern Tragedy", Adams and Hathaway, 115.
24. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 42.
25. Ibid.
26. Watson I, 213.

27. Spingarn II, 113.
28. Ibid., 168.
29. Ibid., 12.
30. "Preface to Don Sebastian", Watson II, 47.
31. "Epilogue to Oedipus", Watson I, 237.
32. Righter, "Heroic Tragedy", in Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 6: Restoration Theatre, 135-138.
33. "Of Heroic Plays", Watson I, 161.
34. Watson I, 204.
35. Ker, ed., Essays of John Dryden, Introduction, xxv.
36. "A defence of an Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 114.
37. "To Roger, Earl of Orrery, Prefixed to the Rival Ladies", Watson I, 2.
38. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 87.
39. "A Parallel Betwixt Painting and Poetry", Watson II, 194.
40. "Of Heroic Plays", Watson I, 159.
41. "An Account of the Ensuing Poem", Watson I, 98.
42. "A Parallel Betwixt Painting and Poetry", Watson II, 194.
43. "Preface to The Great Favourite", Spingarn II, 110-1.
44. "A Defence of An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 126.
45. "The Author's Apology for Heroic Poetry", Watson I, 202.
46. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 87.
47. Watson I, 222. He makes similar remarks in the "Preface to Secret Love": "It is regular, according to the strictest of dramatic laws" (105); and in the "Preface to Tyrannic Love": "yet scenes are everywhere unbroken...."

48. "Preface to Don Sebastian", Watson II, 49.
49. Fielding's Tragedy of Tragedies ends with five characters killing one another in turn. (Quoted from C.V. Deane, Dramatic Theory and the Rhymed Heroic Play, 142.)
"Defence of the Epilogue", Watson I, 172.
50. "Preface to The Great Favourite", Spingarn II, 106.
51. "A Defence of the Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 122.
52. I am indebted to George Watson for this remark.
53. "The Poetics of Aristotle", Adams and Hathaway, 123.
54. "The Author's Apology for Heroic Poetry", Watson I, 197.
55. "Discourse on Tragedy", Adams and Hathaway, 7.
56. Watson II, 49.
57. Watson I, 157.
58. Ibid.
59. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 85.
60. "Preface to The Great Favourite", Spingarn II, 107.
61. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 87-8.
62. "To Roger, Earl of Orrery", Watson I, 8.
63. "A Defence of An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 115.
64. Milton: "Preface to Paradise Lost", Spingarn I, 206.
Dryden: "To Roger, Earl of Orrery", Watson I, 8.
Morris Freedman in his article "Milton and Dryden on Rhyme" alleges that "Dryden finds in rhyme itself, irrespective of sense, a decorative value". This gross misjudgement is formed perhaps in misreading Dryden. The original sentence is:
"This last consideration has already answered an objection which some have made, that rhyme is only an embroidery of sense, to make that which is ordinary in itself pass for excellent with less examination."
65. Watson I, 141.

66. L.P. Goggin, "This Bow of Ulysses" in H.H. Petit's edition of Essays and Studies in Language and Literature, 49-86.
67. "Answer to Davenant", Spingarn II, 54-55.
68. "A Parallel Betwixt Painting and Poetry", Watson II, 228.
69. "Preface to Tyrannic Love", Watson I, 139.
70. "Heads of an Answer to Rymer", Watson I, 218.
71. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 38.
72. "Discourse on Tragedy", Adams and Hathaway, 7.
73. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 41.

- THE STRUCTURE OF THE HEROIC TRAGEDIES -

NOTES - CHAPTER II

1. The Conquest of Granada, Part I, Act V, sc.ii, vol.4, 15.
The quotations from the Conquest of Granada, Aureng-Zebe, and All for Love are taken from Scott and Saintsbury's The Dramatic Works of John Dryden, 8 volumes.
2. Ibid., Part I, Act I, vol.4, 40,43.
3. Ibid., Part I, Act I, vol.4, 43.
4. Ibid., Part I, Act III, vol.4, 70.
5. Ibid., Part I, Act V, sc.ii, vol.4, 106.
6. Ibid., Part I, Act IV, sc.ii., vol.4, 88.
7. Ibid., Part II, Act IV, sc.ii, vol.4, 182.
8. Ibid., Part I, Act II, vol.4, 54.
9. Ibid., Part I, Act V, sc.ii, vol.4, 110.
10. Ibid., Part II, Act LV, sc.iii, vol.4, 194.
11. Ibid., Part I, Act III, vol.4, 74.
12. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy", Watson I, 75.
13. In the Prologue to the play (Watson I, 192), Dryden declares that "he has now another taste of wit". Rhyme, his "long-loved mistress", becomes wearisome to him, and his interest turns to the passions.
14. Aureng-Zebe, Act I, vol.5, 203.
15. Ibid., Act I, vol.5, 207.
16. Ibid., Act I, vol.5, 204.
17. Ibid., Act IV, vol.5, 268.
18. Ibid., Act V, vol.5, 280.

19. Ibid., Act IV, vol.5, 269.
20. Ibid., Act IV, vol.5, 258.
21. Ibid., Act IV, vol.5, 264.
22. "To John, Earl of Mulgrave", vol.5, 198.
23. Watson I, 25. D.T. Mace in his article "Dryden's Dialogue on Drama", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 1962, 87-112, notes that in this definition, Dryden has deliberately left out "actions". He does it again in "Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy" (1679). Mace concludes that Dryden follows D'Avenant in believing that actions show nothing essential about the "general history" of nature, as they are bound up with the random events in the "diary of fortune".
24. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy," Watson I, 52.
25. The following is predominantly a Lear image: the Emperor grieved at the ingratitude of Morat and compared himself to a naked tree, which "To winds and winter-storms must stand exposed alone." Aureng-Zebe's famous reflection on life "When I consider life, 'tis all a cheat" is built on the image of time as merciless deceiver luring men to love on empty promises--the same image that Macbeth uses in his bitter animadversion on life: "Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow/ Creeps in life's petty pace from day to day..."
26. All for Love, Act V, vol.5, 423.
27. Waith, The Herculean Hero, 200.
28. Watson I, 222.
29. Examples are numerous. Here are two more:
 "For I despair/To have you whole, and scorn to take you half."
 "If, as a friend, you ask my judgment, go;/If, as a lover,
 stay."
30. All for Love, Act III, vol.5, 389.
31. Ibid., Act III, vol.5, 390.
32. Ibid., Act I, vol.5, 346-7.
33. Ibid., Act IV, vol.5, 403.

34. Goggin, "This Bow of Ulysses", in H.H. Petit's edition of Essays and Studies in Language and Literature, 49-86.

- THE HEROIC HEROES -

NOTES - CHAPTER III

1. Hartsock, "Dryden's Plays: A Study in Ideas", in R. Shafer's edition of Seventeenth Century Studies, 2nd ser., 71-176.
2. Winterbottom in his article "The Development of the Hero in Dryden's Tragedies", JEGP, (1953), 161-73, shows that Dryden's heroic tragedies receive unity in having certain changes which take place in the heroic type. "The process involved is," he says, "briefly, a movement away from the hero as a social iconoclast towards the hero as embodiment of a social ideal."
3. The Conquest of Granada, Part II, Act I, sc.i, Vol.4, 132.
4. Ibid., Part I, Act II, sc.i, vol.4, 58.
5. Ibid., Part I, Act III, sc.i., vol.4, 71.
6. Ibid., Part II, Act IV, sc.ii, vol.4, 192.
7. Waith, The Herculean Hero, 178.
8. Kirsch, Dryden's Heroic Drama, 121.
9. Michael Alssid, "The Design of Dryden's Aureng-Zebe", JEGP, (1956), 452-69. He thinks that "the hero's constancy towards an unworthy cause reveals his flaws--despair and debilitating self-righteousness."
10. Aureng-Zebe, Act III, vol.5, 247.
11. Ibid., Act I, vol.5, 218.
12. Ibid., Act V, vol.5, 298.
13. "Prologue to All for Love", vol.5, 340.
14. All for Love, vol.5, 362.
15. "Preface to All for Love", Watson I, 222.
16. Watson I, 246.

- CONCLUSION -

NOTES - CHAPTER IV

1. Dryden was parodied in his own day in Buckingham's The Rehearsal. L.C. Knights in his Explorations degrades the Heroic Tragedy as "artificial in a completely damaging sense and by contemporary standards."
2. Leavis, "'Antony and Cleopatra' and 'All for Love': A Critical Exercise", Scrutiny, (1936), 158-69.
Nazareth, "All for Love: Dryden's Hybrid Play", English Studies in Africa, (1963), 154-63.
T.S. Eliot is perhaps the only one who rates Dryden above Shakespeare. Dryden's blank verse "is really the norm of blank verse for later blank verse playwrights." Homage to Dryden.
3. Dobrée, Restoration Tragedy. He suggests that the Restoration tragedy mapped out not human emotions but ideals, which are changeable through the ages, not permanent.
4. Jefferson, "The Significance of Dryden's Heroic Plays", Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, (1940), 125-39, and Righter, "Restoration Tragedy", Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies 6: Restoration Theatre, 135-58.
5. Bruce King, Dryden's Major Plays, 2.
6. "Preface to All for Love", Watson I, 231.
7. Corrigan, ed., Theatre in the Twentieth Century, 11.

- BIBLIOGRAPHY -

- Abbreviations -

EIC	<u>Essays in Criticism</u>
ELH	<u>English Literary History</u>
E. St.	<u>Englische Studien</u>
JEGP	<u>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</u>
MLN	<u>Modern Language Notes</u>
MLR	<u>Modern Language Review</u>
MP	<u>Modern Philology</u>
PMLA	<u>Publications of the Modern Language Association of America</u>
PQ	<u>Philological Quarterly</u>
RES	<u>Review of English Studies</u>
SP	<u>Studies in Philology</u>
TSLL	<u>Texas Studies in Literature and Language</u>

-I- PRIMARY SOURCES

- Adams M. and Benjamin Hathaway, eds. Dramatic Essays of the Neo-classic Age. New York: Benjamin Blom, Inc., 1965.
- Ker, W.P., ed. Essays of John Dryden. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1900.
- Noyes, George R., ed. Selected Dramas of John Dryden. Chicago, New York: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1910.
- Spingarn, J.E., ed. Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.

Scott, Sir Walter and George Saintsbury, eds. The Dramatic Works of John Dryden. 8 vols. Edinburgh: William Patterson, 1882.

Watson, George, ed. John Dryden: Of Dramatic Poesy and Other Critical Essays. 2 vols. Everyman Library. London: Dent, 1962.

-II- SECONDARY SOURCES

- A - BOOKS

Chase, Lewis N. The English Heroic Play. New York, 1903.

Deane, Cecil V. Dramatic Theory and the Rhymed Heroic Play. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931.

Dobrée, Bonamy. Restoration Tragedy 1660-1720. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.

Eliot, T.S. Homage to Dryden. London: Hogarth Press, 1924.

-----, John Dryden the Poet, the Dramatist, the Critic. New York: Terence & Elsa Holliday, 1932.

Elwin, Malcolm. The Playgoer's Handbook to Restoration Drama. London: Cape, 1928.

Green, Clarence C. The Neo-Classic Theory of Tragedy in England During the 18th Century. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1934.

King, Bruce. Dryden's Major Plays. New York: Barnes and Noble Inc., 1966.

Kirsch, Arther C. Dryden's Heroic Drama. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Nicoll, Allardyce. A History of English Drama 1600-1900. vol. 1. Restoration Drama 1600-1700. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Prior, Moody E. Language of Tragedy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947.

Russell, T.W. Voltaire, Dryden and Heroic Tragedy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1946.

- Sherwood, Margaret. Dryden's Dramatic Theory and Practice. ("Yale University Studies in English", Vol. IV). Boston, 1899.
- Singh, Sarup. The Theory of Drama in the Restoration Period. Bombay: Orient Longmans, 1963.
- Waith, Eugene M. The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare and Dryden. London: Chatto & Windus, 1962.
- Ward, Charles E. The Life of John Dryden. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961.
- Verrall, A.W. Lectures on Dryden. ed. by Margaret de G. Verrall. New York: Russell and Russell Inc., 1963.
- Zebouni, Selma A. Dryden: A Study in Heroic Characterization. (Louisiana State University Studies, Number 16) Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965.

-II- SECONDARY SOURCES

- B - ARTICLES

- Alssid, Michael W. "The Design of Dryden's Aureng-Zebe", JEGP, LXIV (1956), 452-69.
- Bohn, William E. "The Development of Dryden's Literary Criticism", PMLA, XXII (1907), 56-139.
- Brower, Reuben A. "An Allusion to Europe: Dryden and Tradition", ELH, XIX (1952), 38-48.
- "Dryden's Epic Manner and Virgil", PMLA, LV (1940) 119-38.
- "Dryden's Poetic Diction and Virgil", PQ, XVIII (1939), 211-17.
- Child, C.G. "The Rise of the Heroic Play", MLN, XIX (1904), 166-73.
- Clark, W.S. "The Definition of the Heroic Play in the Restoration Period", RES, VIII (1932), 437-44.
- "The Platonic Element in the Restoration Play", PMLA, XLV (1930), 623-6.

- ". "The Sources of the Restoration Heroic Play", RES, IV (1928), 49-63.
- Dutton, George B. "Theory and Practice in English Tragedy, 1650-1800", E.St., XLIX (1916), 190-219.
- Freedman, Morris. "Milton and Dryden on Rhyme", Huntington Library Quarterly, XXIV (1961), 337-44.
- Friedland, L.S. "The Dramatic Unities in England", JGEP, X (1911), 56-89, 453-467.
- Fujimura, Thomas. "The Appeal of Dryden's Heroic Plays", PMLA, LXXV (1960), 37-45.
- Gagen, Jean. "Love and Honour in Dryden's Heroic Plays", PMLA, LXXVII (1962), 208-220.
- Goggin, L.P. "This Bow of Ulysses", in H.H. Petit, ed., Essays and Studies in Language and Literature. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1964, 49-86.
- Harrison, T.P. "Othello as Model for Dryden's All for Love", TSSL, VII (1927), 136-43.
- Hartsock, Mildred E. "Dryden's Plays: A Study in Ideas", in Robert Shafer, ed., Seventeenth Century Studies, 2nd. ser., Princeton, 1937, 71-176.
- Hathaway, Baxter. "John Dryden and the Function of Tragedy", PMLA, LVIII (1943), 665-73.
- Jefferson, D.W. "The Significance of Dryden's Heroic Plays", Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, V (1940), 125-39.
- Leavis, F.R. "'Antony and Cleopatra' and 'All for Love': A Critical Exercise", Scrutiny, V (1936), 158-69.
- Leech, Clifford. "Restoration Tragedy: A Reconsideration", Durham University Journal, XI (1950), 106-15.
- Legouis, Pierre. "Corneille and Dryden as Dramatic Critics", in Seventeenth Century Studies presented to Sir H.J.C. Grierson, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938, 269-91.

- Lynch, Kathleen. "Conventions of Platonic Drama in Heroic Plays of Orrery and Dryden", PMLA, XLIV (1929), 456-71.
- Mace, Dean T. "Dryden's Dialogue on Drama", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXV (1962), 87-112.
- Nazareth, Peter. "All for Love, Dryden's Hybrid Play", English Studies in Africa, VI (1963), 154-63.
- Nicoll, Llardyce. "The Origin and Types of the Heroic Tragedy", Anglia, XLIV (1920), 325-36.
- Osborn, Scott. "Heroical Love in Dryden's Heroic Drama", PMLA, LXXIII, Pt. 2 (1958), 480-90.
- Parsons, A.E. "The English Heroic Play", MLR, XXXIII (1938), 1-14.
- Righter, Anne. "Heroic Tragedy", in Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 6: Restoration Theatre. 135-58.
- Rothstein, Eric. "English Tragic Theory in the Late 17th Century", ELH, XXIX (1962), 306-23.
- Sherwood, J.C. "Dryden and the Rules" the Preface to *Troilus and Cressida*", Comparative Literature, II (1950), 73-83.
- Stearns, D.T. "Imitation of Shakespeare in Dryden's *All for Love*", TSLI, VI (1964), 39-46.
- Trowbridge, Hoyt. "Dryden's Essay on the Dramatic Poetry of the Last Age", PQ, XXII (1943), 240-50.
- "The Place of Rules in Dryden's Criticism", MP, XLIV (1946), 84-96.
- Tupper, J.W. "The Relation of the Heroic Play to the Romances of Beaumont and Fletcher", PMLA, XX (1905), 584-621.
- Walcott, Fred G. "John Dryden's Answer to Thomas Rymer's 'The Tragedy of the Last Age'", PQ, XV (1936), 194-214.
- Wallerstein, Ruth. "Dryden and the Analysis of Shakespeare's Techniques", RES, XIX (1943), 165-85.
- Williamson, G. "The Occasion of an Essay of Dramatic Poesy", MP, XLIV (1946-47), 1-9.

Winterbottom, J.A. "The Development of the Hero in Dryden's Tragedies", JEGP, LII (1953), 161-73.

------. "The Place of Hobbesian Ideas in Dryden's Tragedies", JEGP, LVII (1958), 665-83.

Wood, Paul S. "Native Elements in English Neo-Classicism", MP, XXIV (1926), 201-8.

------. "The Opposition to Neo-Classicism in England between 1660-1700:", PMLA, XLIII (1928), 182-197.

B29876